

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 762

CS 206 228

AUTHOR Shuman, R. Baird, Ed.
TITLE Education in the 80's: English.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8106-3152-0; ISBN-0-8106-3152-2
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 167p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Education Association, Order Dept., The Academic Building, Saw Mill Rd., West Haven, CT 06516 (Stock No. 3151-2-00, \$8.95 paper; Stock No. 3152-0-00, \$12.95 cloth).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Assisted Instruction; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *English Curriculum; *English Instruction; *English Teacher Education; Exceptional Persons; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Learning Theories; Mass Media; Minority Groups; Oral Language; Research Needs; Teacher Attitudes; Writing (Composition)

ABSTRACT

The essays in this collection are designed to provide an overview of the most pressing issues and ideas with which English teachers contend today and will contend in the near future. The contributors, 22 English teachers and educators, have attempted to view change in a sufficiently broad perspective to enable them to make responsible predictions about the 1980s, taking into account the social and economic variables that will necessarily affect the United States during this time. Titles of the essays reflect concerns for the following topics: (1) writing and the English curriculum; (2) literature study in the 1980s; (3) language and the English curriculum; (4) holonomic knowing (a very generalized model of holistic learning); (5) oral English and the literacy imperative; (6) reading and the teaching of English; (7) the basics in the 1980s; (8) English in the elementary and middle schools; (9) the training of English teachers in the 1980s; (10) the media, media literacy, and the English curriculum; (11) computer-assisted English instruction; (12) English as a second language in the 1980s; (13) English and vocational education; (14) dealing with sexual stereotypes; (15) English for minority groups, for the gifted and talented, and for the handicapped; and (16) needed research in the teaching of English.

(RL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Education in the 80's:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ENGLISH

R. Baird Shuman
Editor

University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign

Classroom Teacher Consultant

Judith Cantera

High School English Teacher

Pullman, Washington

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

National Education
Assoc. of the United
States

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

ED199762

CS206228

The Advisory Panel

Margaret J. Early, Associate Dean, School of Education, Syracuse University, New York

Melvin Graham, Reading Resource Teacher, Bruceton-Brandonville Elementary School, Bruceton Mills, West Virginia

Fay Louise Grindstaff, Professor of Education, Department of Secondary Education, California State University, Northridge

Julie M. Jensen, Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, The University of Texas at Austin

Joseph O. Milner, Chairperson, Department of Education, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Stanley Morse, English Chairperson, C.M. Russell High School, Great Falls, Montana

Frederick B. Tuttle, Jr., Associate Professor, State University of New York, Brockport

Sherry Curtis Vaughn, Ph.D. Candidate, University of Arizona, Tucson, and Title I Consultant at Indian Oasis School District, Papago Indian Reservation

Alice A. Parsons Walner, Wootton High School, Rockville, Maryland

Nancy M. Wells, San Pedro High School, California

William W. West, Professor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa

In memory of
RICHARD FRANKLIN POWERS
5 March 1926—6 November 1978

*Children mattered in his life
and
he mattered in the lives of children*

Copyright © 1981

National Education Association of the United States

Stock No. 3151-2-00 (paper)
3152-0-00 (cloth)

Note

The opinions expressed in this publication should not be construed as representing the policy or position of the National Education Association. Materials published as part of the NEA Education in the 80's series are intended to be discussion documents for teachers who are concerned with specialized interests of the profession.

Acknowledgments

"The Training of English Teachers in the 80's" by R. Baird Shuman and "Media Literacy and the English Curriculum" by James Morrow appeared in adapted versions in the *English Journal*, January 1980.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Education in the 80's—English

(Education in the 80's)

Includes bibliographical references.

1. English language—Study and teaching—

Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Shuman, R. Baird.

II. Cantera, Judith. III. Series.

LB1631.E36 428'.007 81-1453

ISBN 0-8106-3152-0 AACR2

ISBN 0-8106-3152-2 (pbk.)

Contents

Foreword	Judith Cantera	8
Introduction	R. Baird Shuman	10
Chapter 1.	Writing and the English Curriculum: Out of Silence, a Voice Donald M. Murray	13
Chapter 2.	Literature Study in the 80's: A Look at the Possibilities Theodore W. Hipple	20
Chapter 3.	Language and the English Curriculum Yetta M. Goodman	30
Chapter 4.	Holonomic Knowing: A Challenge for Education in the 80's Bob Samples	36
Chapter 5.	Oral English and the Literacy Imperative Marvin Klein	46
Chapter 6.	Reading and the Teaching of English William S. Palmer	54
Chapter 7.	The Basics in the 80's Gary Tate	64
Chapter 8.	English in the Elementary School: What, How, and Why We Teach Iris M. Tiedt	69
Chapter 9.	English in the Middle School Jeffrey N. Golub	79
Chapter 10.	The Training of English Teachers in the 80's R. Baird Shuman	85
Chapter 11.	The Media and the English Curriculum Betty P. Cleaver	93
Chapter 12.	Media Literacy and the English Curriculum James Morrow	100
Chapter 13.	Computer-Assisted English Instruction Richard S. Powers	108

Chapter 14.	ESL in the 80's Charles R. Duke	113
Chapter 15.	English and Vocational Education for the 80's Charles J. Law, Jr., and Denny T. Wolfe, Jr.	121
Chapter 16.	Dealing with Sexual Stereotypes Beverly Bates Heneghan	126
Chapter 17.	English and Minority Groups Sandra E. Gibbs	130
Chapter 18.	English for the Gifted and Talented Jan A. Guffin	141
Chapter 19.	English for the Handicapped Nancy S. McHugh	148
Chapter 20.	Needed Research in the Teaching of English Roy C. O'Donnell	154
Chapter 21.	A Classroom Teacher's Crystal Ball for Teaching English in the 80's Mildred Gamble	160
The Contributors		164

Editor

R. Baird Shuman is Professor of English and Director of English Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. Among the numerous books he has written are *Elements of Early Reading Instruction*, *Strategies in Teaching Reading: Secondary*, and (with Robert J. Krajewski) *The Beginning Teacher: A Practical Guide to Problem Solving*, published by NEA.

Classroom Teacher Consultant

Judith Cantera is a high school English teacher in Pullman, Washington.

As teachers we are aware of the explosion of knowledge that has occurred during this century. While we realize that individual mastery of the immense, rapidly expanding body of knowledge that is our heritage is no longer possible, we know that our students must acquire skills that will enable them to continue to learn throughout their lives. However, a less frequently discussed, but no less important, consequence of this phenomenon is the need for teachers to continually expand their own knowledge and skills.

The 70's has left us an awesome legacy. As English teachers we are asked to offer students a vision of a multicultural society in which advancement will be based on individual achievement rather than on sex, race, or wealth. Yet we live in a society that is still debating the merits of ERA, busing, and affirmative action; a society in which 20 percent of the population owns 80 percent of the national wealth. We are asked to help all students develop their highest capabilities at their own pace. Yet we work within a lock-step system extending from kindergarten through grade 12 and leading to "higher education." We are asked to help students appreciate the unique capabilities and contributions of all individuals, of all cultures, of standard English as well as of dialects, of languages other than English. Yet we must evaluate our students on their ability to pass minimum competency tests of grammar, mechanics, and usage of standard English. We are asked to prepare students to live productively in a society that receives and transmits much of its information through radios, televisions, films, telephones, and computers. Yet we must still regard classroom televisions, films, and tapes as supplementary materials, unnecessary frills. We are employees of large institutions during a time when many people have lost faith in institutions. We live in a society characterized by mobility and change during a time when a sizeable portion of our population longs for a return to an idyllic past. We are preparing youth for the future during a time when increasing numbers of young people choose suicide. We are teachers of language during a time when James Britton, in his *Language*

and *Learning*, tells us that we have outgrown the traditional symbols of the family, tribe, or nation that formerly helped young people find a meaningful position in adult society.

What, then, is the role of the English teacher? Should we attempt to recreate the past—study the classics; teach traditional grammar; assign five-paragraph themes; create an orderly world that bears little relationship to the world in which our students must live? Should we live in an eternal present—write letters and journals; teach the latest television show; read the current best seller; examine popular presentations of problems with drugs, divorce, and discrimination; offer students a collage from which to construct their own order? Fortunately, there is another alternative—for the 70's has left us not only the chaos of a displaced tradition but also exciting possibilities for the future. A new vision of our society, our achievements, our responsibilities, our future is emerging as we see, hear, read, and write about ourselves as citizens of the "global village." And English teachers who are trained to develop language skills as well as an appreciation of our linguistic heritage are particularly well prepared to help young people synthesize the old and the new to form symbols that will be capable of providing goals and security in this world.

And how can *EDUCATION IN THE 80's: ENGLISH* help in this task? It is neither a catechism nor a cookbook. It does, however, provide an overview of the most pressing issues and ideas with which English teachers contend today and will contend in the near future. Each author is vitally concerned with one of these issues, presenting a personal view and often suggesting classroom strategies as well. These articles should stimulate us to begin to weave our own configuration for the 80's, to link the experience of the various authors to our own experience, to elaborate new patterns as we weave these ideas into the cloth of our own lives in classrooms with young people. I especially hope that this book will suggest areas for teachers to continue to explore as they realize their vision of the future for and with their students in the 80's.

Judith Cantera
High School English Teacher
Pullman, Washington

In the face of the eons, a decade is rather like a drop of water in a huge ocean, a quantity almost too small to be noted. Nevertheless, in terms of human existence, the degree of change that can take place in a decade may be very great indeed. Ever-expanding technology has made some elements of human existence in 1980 drastically different from similar elements in 1970. For example, during the 1970's the miniaturization of some computer components, along with a substantial reduction in their cost, has made computer technology much more a part of the lives of most of the people who will be reading *EDUCATION IN THE 80's: ENGLISH* than it was a decade ago. And because of advances in neurophysiology we now have much more information about how the human mind operates and about how people learn.

Within the lifetimes of many readers of this book, television has changed from a curiosity with very limited programming to a part of the daily lives of nearly everyone. As recently as 1945, the town with three televisions was a rarity in the heartland of the United States; today the home with three televisions is not regarded as unusual. The educational implications of this single change are enormous. Television has brought the whole world into our homes, placing untold varieties of experience within easy reach. But even as this has happened, television has been accused of producing a generation of TV junkies who are passive rather than active, who spend half their lives watching rather than doing, and who, according to some, cannot read, write, or communicate adequately because of what television has done to them. Certainly one would not deny that the improper use of any medium of communication can cause disastrous effects; however, one must also approach the problem with an historical perspective that includes knowledge of the fact that when books first came to be readily available, many people predicted that the universities would be driven out of business because no one would attend lectures when they could buy them in printed form and read them.

The contributors to *EDUCATION IN THE 80's: ENGLISH* have attempted to view change in a sufficiently broad perspective to enable them to make responsible predictions about the 1980's, taking into account the social and economic variables that will necessarily affect the United

States during this time. Crystal balls are at best cloudy objects, but a few generalizations can be made about the crystal ball gazers who contributed to the present effort.

Glimmering through most of the contributions is a fundamental concern and respect for the learner. Although the learner remains central in most of the chapters herein, it is apparent that English teachers in the 1980's will continue to be viewed as the people who are expected to teach the basic skills of literacy. Competency-based testing and calls for accountability will continue to influence English departments at all levels. The back-to-the-basics movement continues to grow, despite the fact that it is often based on narrow interpretations, outright falsehoods about how people learn, and a lack of knowledge of who constitutes school populations in a society that mandates compulsory attendance until the age of 16 or 17; this trend has been encouraged by the popular media, and those who control the pursestrings of our educational institutions cannot ignore the outcry—nor should they.

Among those contributors addressing the basics movement, Tate reminds readers, "The trick . . . is somehow to avoid letting our changing world so confuse us that we lose sight of what it is that we are about as teachers of English." O'Donnell calls for more research on what is basic and on how the legitimate basics can best be taught. One can only hope that his reasoned plaint will be heeded by those best able to undertake the sort of research for which he is calling. Samples calls for teachers to move away from reductionist attitudes toward students and their work; rather, he urges teachers to concern themselves with trying to develop what students know and can do rather than with attempting to find out what students cannot do and humiliating them for their deficiencies.

Duke, Law, Wolke, Heneghan, Gibbs, Guffin, and McHugh suggest ways of reaching the diverse clientele of today's educational institutions, elaborating on how to benefit from all that a pluralistic society has to offer without allowing the pluralism of that society to be divisive to its members. Cleaver, Morrow, and Powers discuss some ways in which the new technologies can be used to broaden the range of education in English classes. Morrow also concerns himself with the "new literacy," media literacy, which is a step beyond mere visual literacy. It is really a logical extension of the kinds of literacy that Murray and Palmer write about in their respective chapters on writing and reading, and it is closely related in many ways to the oral English with which Klein is concerned in his chapter. Goodman discusses the centrality of language study in the English curriculum, and Hipple writes of the changes taking place in the literature component of English classes as adolescent litera-

ture comes to be an important genre unto itself, a phenomenon that has occurred essentially in the 1970's and that shows signs of gaining in significance during the 1980's.

Tiedt and Golub focus on the teaching of English in the elementary school and the middle school, respectively, and Shuman addresses the question of how English teachers might best be trained in the 1980's. In these chapters, much emphasis is placed on the learners as they relate to the subject matter rather than on the subject matter that must be imposed on the learners. Gamble takes a broad overview of where the profession is going and identifies writing as the single most important area of English instruction in the 80's.

In what is probably the broadest chapter of the book, Samples tells of recent brain research, going into some of the geography of the human brain and into what increased knowledge of the brain's physiology means for learners and for teachers. Because brain research may soon have a profound effect on all learning and teaching, this chapter on holonomic knowing has striking implications for all educators, not for English teachers alone.

No effort has been made to select persons with similar outlooks to contribute to this book. Rather people have been asked to contribute because they have some special expertise in the subject under discussion in their chapters. As a result, statements in some chapters may, indeed, be contradictory to statements in other chapters. Dissent is wholly appropriate in a volume of this kind, and the editor made no attempt to minimize it.

A time for renewal is upon us. The editor and the contributors hope that *EDUCATION IN THE 80's: ENGLISH* may suggest to its readers means of renewing themselves as the enthusiastic professionals whom they are.

R. Baird Shuman

CHAPTER 1

Writing and the English Curriculum: Out of Silence, a Voice

Donald M. Murray

Stephanie Swift caught Aldon Stern watching her through the classroom door. High school students bugged her these days, but Aldon did not. She couldn't get through to him at all. He was one of those who just glowered at life—"absolute" the students would call him in 1986's cliché.

She made herself finish the last sip of coffee and put the thermos in the drawer. She wasn't going to waste twelve-dollar-a-pound coffee even if she'd put it through her new aerator, and she wasn't going to give up having at least one cup of coffee before she started teaching in a classroom that was 43 degrees. It was February, only two months now to spring. The classroom would warm up later with body heat, but this was Monday morning, 8:00 A.M.

The bell sounded in the dimly lit corridor, and she opened the door. Aldon Stern lumbered by her, and she stood back against the chalkboard trying to figure out where she would put chairs for the six students she'd gotten from Mike Hanna's class. It had been a long time since they'd hired a new teacher when one left.

"What time did you get home last night?" Agatha asked.

"One, I guess, or later," Stephanie replied.

Agatha's mother was on the union negotiating committee and spent hours trying to figure out how to force the city to hire another teacher.

They decided there was nothing to be done. Stephanie didn't know why she bothered to serve. But no one could afford to strike, not in 1986.

"Here's more dummies."

Stephanie turned to the door and saw a hulking student who could have been Aldon's brother smiling at her. He was carrying a folding chair. She'd gotten used to the bulky sweaters over sweaters that the students wore, and even the mittens that most of them wore in class, but this was the first time extra students had showed up carrying their own folding chairs. The boy moved in followed by five others. They looked at the classroom with her; there weren't any rows any more, just a mass of students.

"That makes 52," she heard herself saying out loud. "Shove my desk over there in the corner by the window and line your chairs up under the chalkboard."

"We going to teach?" said the new boy on the end.

"Perhaps you will." She tried to smile.

I don't know how I can teach this many students writing, she thought. I can't sit behind my desk any more, not and see all the Aldons. "Eye contact," they'd said when she'd been an English education major in the 60's. That seemed a century ago. At 5 feet, 3 inches I'll end up standing on the desk to make eye contact, Stephanie thought.

"Okay," she said to the new students, "You're at the chalkboard; why don't you teach us what you know about writing?"

They just looked sullenly at her. Every time you get a class working, you get new students and have to start over again.

"I know that sounded sarcastic; I didn't mean it to. We teach each other in this class. The students in the class teach me about my writing and I teach some of them about theirs, I hope."

"You write, too?"

"Yes," and she waited, wondering where she learned to wait. It was a lot earlier than that summer program back in the 70's when she learned to write with her students. And then she thought she couldn't do it, not with five classes of 25 students, but she did. Yet this class would make her total class load more than 300 students.

"Well, it's got to be neat," said one of the new students, a thin, intense girl. "Margins and no words not spelled right. You know, the basic stuff."

"Speak up." A voice from the rear. It sounded like Aldon, but he was usually asleep by now.

The girl looked startled, and Stephanie laughed, "I've told them to do that to me. Speak right out. It's noisy in here just with all of us breathing."

The girl smiled, jumped up, hesitated, and then turned to the chalkboard behind her. She folded up her chair and started printing neatly. "Neatness," she drew a line under that, and then under that she put "straight margins, good penmanship, punctuation, correct spelling, topic paragraph, topic sentences, order."

The class started to snicker, and Stephanie held up her hand. It was a good thing that Mike Hanna had gone into the army, like so many other teachers. No loss. He'd be a better drill sergeant than a teacher.

A voice boomed out from the back of the room, "That's not writing."

Stephanie turned to quiet him for the moment, but the new girl was being defended by one of the five sitting in front of the chalkboard. "Of course it is. Writing is communicating. You want to get a job, you gotta make it neat."

Stephanie thought that she was getting too old for this. At 43 she'd heard all the arguments and heard them all a hundred times.

"Make what neat?" asked Rebecca.

Stephanie smiled. She once thought that Rebecca never paid attention. She always sat by the window, looking out on the urban landscape of construction halted years ago, as if a mad king had blown a whistle. Every time she looked out the window, Stephanie saw the crane rusting, an artifact from a lost civilization in which she'd lived.

"What do you mean *what*?" said the first new guy.

I was going to get their names before class started. I've got to fill out those forms. We shouldn't have students teaching students, not until the forms are filled out, Stephanie thought.

"The *what* is what it's all about."

"I don't know the *what*."

Aldon boomed, "That's what the problem is. You gotta have a *what* before you have all this other stuff."

Stephanie felt the eyes of all the new students looking at her. She could see that they felt that this was absolutely crazy, and she wanted to tell them that she would have felt the same way once, when she'd been more interested in teaching than in learning.

"The *what* is what you have to say." A quiet voice from the middle of the class. Yes, it must be Norma. "You have to have something to say before you can make it neat, that's all. Neatness is okay, but it comes at the end of the process."

"I don't understand." It was Ms. Neat again, the one who wrote on the board. "You have the *what*. You do the assignment."

"What assignment?" Rebecca asked.

"You know, in the anthology book. You read the story and then

you tell the teacher what he, I mean she, wants." Suddenly the new girl look guiltily at Stephanie, who hoped her face was blank.

"Awh. That's not writing, that's testing."

Stephanie thought of all the research that was being done—good research into how the brain works and what the writing process is and how language is used. They kept discovering more and more things that the students knew if you listened to them and if you didn't teach them too much. She looked at the desk and knew what the envelope at the corner of the desk said. Next year she'd be assigned to advanced classes. She had the seniority now and she could be part of the new elitism. No more kids who called themselves "dummies," who knew there were no jobs out there for them. When was it that they started the new small classes for the brightest students and dumped the rest on the baby sitters who didn't have enough seniority to teach first track students? She'd even liked the idea when the new School Committee decided not to have most of the students taught. "We have limited resources and we have to concentrate them on the students who can take best advantage of them." It made sense. Something was needed to stop the terminal recession. And if she did take the new assignment, it would mean fewer students and more money.

"What do you mean there are no assignments in this class? What do you do, nothin'?"

"Doesn't she get called up before the Competency Board for not teaching nothin'?"

Stephanie smiled at the double negative. Back in the 70's she would have jumped on him for the error. Not any more, not in front of this class anyway.

"In this class we find our own subjects. We write something that is important to us." Stephanie remembered when Ron couldn't find anything to write about; now he was lecturing the new kids. "We write in our own voice, and then we make it neat."

"You write about anything?"

"Anything, if it's important and worth writing about. You decide."

"And you learn a lot, more than that other stuff," Rebecca said. "We read it and rewrite it after we've read it."

Stephanie kept feeling she should move in and take charge. That was the trouble with her classes, they never gave her a chance to teach. She thought of Aldon who usually slept and Ruth who couldn't write a shopping list and Albert who spelled his own name with an *e* one day and a *u* another, but especially Aldon because he got to her. He looked at her as if he knew something about her that wasn't very nice.

There was a noise in the classroom, and she realized Aldon was

pushing his way through the chairs and moving diagonally through the class, right at her. He came and sat beside her on the desk. "I know how you feel. We are all dummies—low track. You know how we get dumped on. I didn't like this class; I didn't trust you." He nodded at Stephanie, and she wondered if she blushed. "But I'll show you how this class works. I got a piece of writing, and I need help on it."

Stephanie was aware of the quiet. It was February, and Aldon had never published before. Every once in a while, in the few conferences she could get in, there would seem to be a glimpse of something in a paper, just a line or two, but when she tried to respond to it, he'd grow sullen and glower at her.

"Listen, this is just a draft." Aldon glared at the class. "I know it isn't right yet, but I need some help, I think. I mean, I think there may be something there, but I just wrote it last night late."

"The rule, Aldon," Rebecca laughed.

Aldon glared at her, and Stephanie said to the new students, "Disraeli, an English politician and writer said, 'Never explain,' and we make it a rule never to explain before we read."

Aldon took his pages in his two fists and opened his mouth. Nothing came out. He cleared his throat; it sounded like a Saint Bernard, "Harumph, harumph." Then glaring at the page he started to read.

My dad couldn't go in to see her nights. He had to work, so I spent the nights in the hospital by her bed. I can see her face still. The light was soft, a night light, but the shadows on her face hard, the face was sharp and sunken. She'd lost a lot of weight. She'd been a big woman, but she'd gotten so light I could carry her when she was still home. She laughed about that, or tried to.

We talked of my married sisters, of Dad and that job he hated, yes, the beer and what he'd do. What I'd do. It wasn't hard, talking to someone who's dying. You don't understand if you haven't done it. At least it wasn't hard for me, not like I expected it to be. She was dying and she knew it and she knew I knew it. It was easier then when we all knew it.

One night I was just sitting there, holding her hand and I didn't feel nothing. I was thinking of football, I don't think I dozed off. She kidded me when I did that. Once I fell off the chair. Another time I put my head down and slept sorta' on her bed, but when I looked back to her there was no pain. She was smiling and all those pain lines were gone. When my sister June's baby first smiled they told me it was gas, but not with Mother. That was a real smile and it wasn't sad at all. Not then. I went to the nurse and then called Dad off the night shift. He cried, but I couldn't. I told him how pretty a dying it was, so peaceful she was. No pain no more.

The class was silent, and Aldon looked up from the paper at last. He glowered around the room, looking at each face. Stephanie watched him. He could outglower anyone. Slowly his face turned to her, and she felt herself hold out her hand. He looked down, puzzled, and then grabbed it. Her hand seemed to disappear in his paw. Maybe it was gone forever. Then it was being pumped up—down, up—down. She had never known why he'd slept in class. She didn't think anyone in the school had known about Aldon's mother.

"That was a nice piece of work, Aldon. I'm so sorry to hear about your mother."

"Yeah. Well," he shrugged. "It was good to write about it I guess. But I want to make it better."

"You know it's good," Stephanie said. They watched the class nodding Yes together.

"I guess. No, I know. For me anyway."

"For any of us."

"Well, I'd still like to know what I can do."

"Maybe you could start nearer the end," Rebecca said. "Weave that stuff in the beginning in later."

"Yeah, if you start near the end," Ron added, "Remember on Anne's paper and Steve's how you had more suspense."

"And give us more information." That was the new girl, Ms. Neat. "If you're willing to tell us. I'd like to know more. My father was sick—he got well—and I wondered."

"I didn't tell you too much?" Aldon asked.

"No. Not enough really," said Paul. "I mean, I guess I was really moved because it was your mother. I mean, I like you and I'm sorry. But I don't really see her, what she'd looked like. I mean, if you're willing to tell."

"Yeah, I guess. I mean I think people ought to know what death is like. We're all gonna do it."

There were a few nervous laughs, but Aldon didn't glower at them. "Yeah, that's all right. Death can be funny, or things around it anyway can be funny."

The bell rang and everyone swept up their books and started out of the room. The new kids folded up their chairs and she started to call them back and get their names for the record. Never mind—she'd get them tomorrow, and she'd have conferences with the new ones while the class wrote or worked in groups with peer leaders. She wondered if any parent cared that high school students were doing so much teaching. Probably not. The new students might have the idea that you had to have a mother die to write a paper. She'd get them thinking about

their own world, whatever it was like. There would be time, and that was good because it took time.

Stephanie picked up the letter from the principal about next year's assignment as the new class poured into the room, trying to push between the rows of crowded chairs to their seats. She wrote on the letter, "Thanks for the opportunity, but I think I'll stay where I am, for another year anyway." She folded the letter and put it in the envelope. The other teachers would think her crazy.

"Hey, Ms. Swift, who's gonna teach today?"

"Not me. You want to try?"

CHAPTER 2

Literature Study in the 80's: A Look at the Possibilities

Theodore W. Hippie

The future of literature study in grades 7-12 ultimately comes down to two questions: What ought to be taught? How should we teach it? In this regard literature differs from a number of other secondary school subjects like drivers' training, social dancing, bookkeeping, and even, in some schools, grammar, in which a prior question, a "why," exists: Why should we teach it? No uncertainty exists in relation to literature study. Teachers, students, parents, and the public at large agree, though perhaps with varying intensity, that the study of literature in the schools is good. It makes sense, merits its place, and deserves to be maintained and enriched.

Together we embrace certain tenets about the study of literature. We believe that literature is fun, enjoyable, a source of pleasure for students in school and for the adult community they will soon join. We believe that literature provides a record of humankind's yearnings, achievements, and failures and that today's students can learn much about themselves by examining in literature the struggles of others. We believe that the study of literature not only typically affords but, indeed, almost universally forces an exploration of values, both those to be discovered in the literature and those to be developed in its readers. We believe that literature can be a moral force, an instrument that has the potential to benefit humankind in important ways. We believe in

the utilitarian aspects of literature study, in its power to make us better readers. And finally we believe that literature can often be art, a glorious rendering into language of imaginative and significant vision, a subject that richly rewards its careful and continuing study.

No reason now exists to support a contention that these principles will be less firmly held in the 80's. Even giving the deserved nod to the expanding world of technology, one can still assume that literature study will be a dominant part of the secondary English curriculum in the 80's. It is too important, too humanizing not to be. But both the "what" and the "how" of literature study will undergo transformations of some dimension. Students of 1990 are likely to study a somewhat different literature and to study it somewhat differently than did students of 1980.

But before progressing with first the "what" and then the "how" of this literature study of the 80's, I must offer a few caveats, in part for self-protection in case my predictions ultimately prove to be excessively wide of the mark. One caution deals with the nature of educational change—an intermittent, inconsistent, almost (it seems) random process. Schools 30 miles apart can be 30 years apart. The innovation of school A is the time-honored tradition of school B. The new method described in *The English Journal* is adopted by one teacher, rejected by a second, never seen by a third. Moreover, when one focuses prediction rather narrowly, on, in the specific case here, the study of literature in the decade of the 80's, the great and grave possibility exists that forces external and unrelated to literature study will render all predictions useless or absurd. For example, school finance controls far more than simply the study of literature, but it does, to a large degree, control that, too. The presence or, more likely, the absence of money for new short story texts, for field trips to see a production of *Death of a Salesman*, for a remedial reading teacher, for records or films, or for a host of other things can have a dramatic effect on the study of literature. So, too, can state mandates, which, at the time of this writing, virtually ignore literature, though at the same time they force teachers away from it to increase their concentration on sometimes ill-chosen "basic" skills.

THE EXPANDED SOURCES OF LITERATURE

Adolescent Literature

Changes in the "what" of literature study will result more from addition than from substitution. That is to say, most of what is studied in literature classes today will still be studied tomorrow, but there will

be more as well. Several broad fields will be added to the standard literature program and, indeed, already are in many schools. (Remember, what may be a breakthrough at one school is old hat at another.) The largest and most comprehensive of these fields is adolescent literature. Adolescent literature has clearly come of age; it is alive and well and living in many teen-agers' libraries, if not always in their English classrooms. Publishers now have young adult departments. The National Council of Teachers of English includes an assembly group, ALAN (the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of NCTE), which has over 1,500 members. Teachers informed about adolescent literature know Judy Blume's books can go through a school faster than news of an unexpected holiday.

Several reasons can be offered to support the prediction that adolescent literature will play an increasingly important role in the English curriculum of the 80's. First, there is constantly more of it. Publishers are realizing that it sells—to students who buy it in bookstores, to teachers who buy it in class sets, to Hollywood producers who buy it for movie possibilities. What was nobody's child in the publishing world, a misfit that floated from the children's department to the adult division, now has a room of its own. And its own editors and promotional personnel.

Secondly, adolescent literature continues to improve as a subgenre of contemporary fiction. Its authors include writers of the first rank. The best definition of adolescent literature is that it is literature written for adolescents, whether about them or not, and a number of really outstanding writers have made that audience their particular goal. I mentioned Judy Blume earlier; her books include *Are You There, God? It's Me, Margaret* and the enormously popular *Forever*. Robin Brancato has written *Winning* and *Blinded by the Light*. Few readers, teen-ager or otherwise, if once they begin, fail to finish Robert Cormier's *The Chocolate War*, *I Am the Cheese*, and *After the First Death* or Sue Ellen Bridgers' *Home Before Dark*. Books by Bette Greene (*Summer of My German Soldier*), Sandra Scoppetone (*The Late Great Me*), M.E. Kerr (*Gentlehands*), and Richard Peck (*Father Figure*) represent a much higher quality of fiction than that found in the so-called teen-age novels of the 50's and 60's. There are even adolescent books that show signs of becoming "young adult classics," to be read by each new wave of young students; these are best typified by Paul Zindel's *Pigman*, S.E. Hinton's *Outsiders*, and Ann Head's *Mr. and Mrs. Bo Jo Jones*. Though these three are now a decade old, their popularity shows no signs of waning. With adolescent literature of such significant quality now abundant, English teachers no longer need to feel they are slumming or robbing Friday's free reading material when they teach it.

Thirdly, today's adolescent literature deals in immediate ways with today's adolescent problems. To mention all the books and all the problems would be too much, but here are some representative ones: teen-age drunkenness in Scoppetone's *Late Great Me*; teen-age sex, explicitly and graphically portrayed, in Klein's *It's OK If You Don't Love Me* and Blume's *Forever*; rape in Peck's *Are You in the House Alone?*; divorce in Danziger's *Pistachio Description*; homosexuality in Scoppetone's *Trying Hard to Hear You* and Holland's *Man Without a Face*; alienation in Cormier's *The Chocolate War*; religious sects in Brancato's *Blinded by the Light*; drugs in the anonymously written *Go Ask Alice*; pregnancy and abortion in Head's *Mr. and Mrs. Bo Jo Jones* and Zindel's *My Darling, My Hamburger*; psychosis in Guest's *Ordinary People* and Neufeld's *Lisa Bright and Dark*. This list, both of the problems and of the books that deal with them, could go on and on, but the point is already evident: adolescent literature has gone well beyond hand-holding and the trauma associated with taking a "C" on a report card home to a stern but ultimately forgiving parent. The summation may well be that if teen-agers experience it, authors for teen-agers will write about it.

Other reasons exist for the emergence of adolescent literature as a prominent aspect of the English program. Adolescent novels are typically short and are written on levels that less able students can handle. Many teachers are now turning to such books as a source of required reading in common. Where formerly all class members read, discussed, took a test on, and wrote a theme about *A Tale of Two Cities*, they now engage in these same activities with Swarthout's *Bless the Beasts and Children* or Robert Peck's *A Day No Pigs Would Die*. The trend seems likely to continue and to grow. Moreover, there is now the Hollywood connection: adolescent books have been made into television movies and have been successful there. To name but three: Blume's *Forever*, Greene's *Summer of My German Soldier*, and Schwartz's *Like Mother, Like Me*.

It is important to reiterate that this use of adolescent literature in English studies will not be reserved for Friday reading days "when all the serious literature has already been completed" or for book reports, as was frequently the case in the past. Rather, such literature will be studied in class, alongside of (or in place of) *Huck Finn* or *Great Expectations*. Teachers are discovering and will continue to discover that they can teach the elements of a novel or explore literary evaluation or conduct values clarification activities almost as well with Bowers' *November, December* as with Bronte's *Jane Eyre*, with the added benefit that fewer students experience reading difficulties. Teachers will accept that the "what" of students' reading is less critical than the "that." It is urgent that students read. If they read and profit from the study of adolescent

literature in the high school, they may well go on to become lifelong readers and, by example and instruction, to make readers of their children. On the other hand, if they are bored or mystified by the study of literature that seems beyond them, they may do less reading or none at all in their adult lives.

Television/Movie Literature

The English curriculum of the 80's will also include the greater study of television literature. One incomparably valuable source of literature study will be the continuing and expanding practice of putting the great classics on television. The PBS Shakespeare series offers the most praiseworthy example. *Hamlet* in the 80's will be read and then watched and then re-read—in short, truly studied—because of its showing on PBS. Other shows on PBS represent superior literary and cinematic achievement, too: *Masterpiece Theatre*, *American Short Stories*, *Once Upon a Classic*. Surely more and more teachers will come to value such shows as these, not simply because they depict literature but also because they are literature.

Then there are the various "mini-series" that the commercial television networks are finding profitable and that teachers are finding teachable. Often these are developed from recent best-selling novels. And though the quality of acting and production is typically less than that on the PBS shows, these can still be fruitfully studied as literature, with explorations into character portrayal, plot development, use of language, and so forth.

Despite how really poor some of them are, despite the justified critical protests made about them, the series shows—the sit-coms or crime fighters or fantasy hours or soap operas—will persist on television. Nielsen ratings being what they are, the television schedule of 1990 will resemble that of 1980 *in name only*. The operative phrase is the italicized one, *in name only*. In other ways the two schedules will be more alike than different, sad to say. *Laverne and Shirley* will have become *Molly and Mary*. *Eight Is Enough* will be cloned into *Sixteen Is Too Many*. Yet as bad as they seem to some, these programs, the staples of daily television, will become the stuff of many an English lesson. With a long overdue recognition by English teachers that their students watch television more than they engage in any other single activity except sleep (including going to school) will come an increased emphasis on that medium as a source of instructional content. Can students learn about protagonists and antagonists by watching *The Rockford Files*? (I'll use shows now current, though we should all be aware that the ratings game may pull

these shows off the air even before the words see print. Still, their reruns will be around . . . and around . . . and around.) Can they study drama through viewing *M*A*S*H*? Are literary elements such as climax, denouement, irony, and tension sufficiently identifiable in episodes of *Taxi* to permit the use of these shows in a literature lesson? Can students learn to evaluate print literature by engaging in evaluations of television shows? Are the values to be found in *Soap* useful in a classroom?

Prime Time School Television (PTST) believes these questions can be answered affirmatively. This Chicago-based, nonprofit organization prepares television-related study guides for use by English teachers. Although most of these guides are for serious productions of high quality (e.g., *Masterpiece Theatre*), it is but a small step to imagine commercially prepared materials for all manner of TV shows, from *Alice* to *Zorro*. Indeed, one can assume that before the decade is out, teachers of English will be able to purchase several weeks in advance a kind of "teachers' TV guide" for all of the upcoming network shows. Such a guide will contain rather complete information: detailed plot synopses, script treatments, themes, items of interest about the actors or the production, even sample discussion and composition questions. Teachers can then plan future lessons, knowing in advance that they can assign specific shows to achieve specific objectives. Moreover, the increased availability and sophistication of copiers will make these shows available to all students.

Much of what appears in the immediately preceding paragraphs could have been written about the movies—those seen in the shopping center theater complexes and those seen on the sure-to-expand Home Box Office kinds of operation. Few today continue to question whether movies can be classified as art: they can be; they are art. And students watch them. It follows, then, that the practice already established (but in too few schools) of studying movies as literature will be expanded and that more and more students will be announcing to their parents, "See you later, folks. I've got to go to the Palace Theater to see my English homework."

The Continuing Classics

Any worries at this time about the classics must be foreshortened: they will survive. And flourish. Why? Because they are classics and repay rereading and reward each new generation of readers—those in the schools in the 80's as well as those in the schools in the 70's, the 60's, and the 50's. Teachers of English will continue to disagree about the

worth of adaptations, including comic strip versions. They will continue to question the value of movie versions. They will continue to debate about the blend of classics to, say, adolescent novels or television shows, about the proper balance. But through all these disagreements and questions and debates, the study of classics will endure; indeed, it will prevail. Long after the novels of Blume have ceased to be printed, after even reruns of *Mork and Mindy* have stopped, after today's Oscar-winning best films have entered history and been forgotten, the classics will still be around.

But they may be presented in slightly altered instructional format. If I had to bet on a single genre for the 80's, it would be the short story. Short, manageable by most students, with quick involvement for readers, the short story may flourish as the answer for English teachers whose students seem never quite to finish (and, in some cases, to start) the longer novel. Thus, the classic authors can be studied via their short stories: Twain's "Man That Corrupted Hadleyburg" instead of *Huck Finn*; Faulkner's "Tall Men" instead of *Light in August*; Hawthorne's "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" instead of *The Scarlet Letter*; Fitzgerald's "Winter Dreams" instead of *The Great Gatsby*. The hope, a logical and justified one, is that students will enjoy the short stories and then go on to the novels of these writers.

One final word on the "what" of literature study in the 80's, and a negative one at that: censorship. I'd like to say that all censorship problems will cease. They will not. They may not increase, but they will certainly not go away. And the list of books censored will continue to read like an honors list of great books. Teachers will still have with them the usual dilemmas: Where to turn for help? How strongly to wage the principle/principal controversy? (Not too stringently. It's better to keep a job and stay around to try to change community attitudes than to be fired and placed on the corner soapbox with only a few civil libertarians for solace. Literature won't suffer if one book is withdrawn.)

THE INCREASED TEACHING OPTIONS

The "how" of literature study in the schools will be, like the "what," more of the same in some schools, a major departure from previous practice in others. Teachers are already discovering that the preoccupation with a return to the "basics" in many ways resembles a return to the 50's, that the teaching materials and methods that failed then are not much more successful when resurrected now.

Elective Courses

Perhaps the saddest outcome of the back-to-basics movement was that it caused the decline of elective course offerings. To be sure, the electives were guilty of excesses, principally too little writing, but had they been given more time, a chance to set their house in order, balanced programs that included attention to all the aspects of the language arts could have emerged.

It may be more fervent hope than sensible forecast, but I predict a return to the elective programs in the 80's. Elective courses particularly enlivened literature programs in the 70's, and they will do so again in the 80's, though perhaps not so extensively. The return will be cautious, without fanfare: first a few "safe" electives (e.g., "Composition for the College-bound," "Modern American Short Stories") at one school, then a few more at another.

The Emphasis on Student Writing

A major change in the "how" of literature teaching will be the increased attention given to writing about literature. All of the "new" electives will be strengthened to withstand the real and trumped up charges they countered unsuccessfully in the 70's: Most notably that they allegedly failed to include enough writing. The new courses, even courses like "Science Fiction" or "Mystery," will include writing. The five-paragraph theme on the plot of a short story or the development of a character in a drama will still be with us, but, happily, other forms of writing will be added in the literature program. Students will write letters to authors and to characters. They will write diary entries, sample dialogues between characters, sketches of scenes an author could have included but did not, alternative endings, obituaries for characters who die, and advertisements for the literature. And students will write not only about or in response to literature but also literature itself: they will try their hand at writing short poems; short story introductions, if not the entire short story; and scenes from plays. What this kind of writing will assure is that those who teach an elective course, be it "Short Stories from Around the World," "Television's Best Programs," or "Movies Are Better Than Ever," will be able to argue forcefully that it attends to all aspects of English, especially writing.

The Role of the Teacher

That portion of the "how" of literature study dealing with the actual behavior of teachers and students in their classrooms will be much the same in 1990 as it was in 1980. Most classes will still be

teacher-centered. The increased study of television and movies will inevitably and happily produce more classroom media events, but, even in these, teachers will continue to be the producers and directors, if not also the leading characters. This prediction of more of the same is not entirely pejorative. Many fine teachers run teacher-centered classrooms with imagination, with excitement, and with considerable student learning. Yet the hope remains that more teachers will consider such alternative but hardly new strategies as letting students do the teaching, using small groups, videotaping, employing role-playing activities, encouraging free reading, and the like.

Teachers in the 80's may—one must be tentative here—have the opportunity to learn about or review these kinds of alternative strategies through increased in-service programs. These should flourish; I believe the money to support them may become available. Some of the programs will be in the schools, as college professors will find themselves expected to venture "into the field" to get the full teaching loads they can no longer get on campus in an age of declining enrollments. If unions get teachers' salaries more into line with those of other workers, then they will ask for professional opportunities for their clients: financial support for convention attendance, days off to observe other teachers, subscriptions to educational journals.

These teachers will take some of what they learn from the convention or the school down the road or the journal article back to their own classrooms. They may learn to structure literature lessons to permit varied reading instead of having all literature studied in common. They may discover that they can manage a classroom focusing on the "Literature of War," for example, that has 30 different students reading 30 different works of literature: novels like *The Red Badge of Courage* or *Johnny Tremain*; poems like "Dulce et Decorum Est" or "I Have a Rendezvous with Death"; dramas like *All My Sons* or *Mother Courage*; short stories like "Two Soldiers" or "In Another Country." They may even decide to teach formal elements like the components of a short story by deductively drawing information from students who have read any number of different stories.

But they will also learn that even on readings in common, alternative student responses are possible and should be sought. After a class has completed the reading of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, one student may write a character sketch of Atticus, another may create a collage representing the various episodes of Jem's growing up, a third may draw a picture of the courtroom, a fourth may prepare the front page of the *Maycomb Tribune* on the day Tom Robinson's guilty verdict was handed down, and a fifth may prepare a test on the novel.

In sum, more teachers in the 80's will give more students more options about more of the literature being studied. The lock-step beat—Act II for tomorrow, Act III for next Monday—that all must march to in unison will not disappear, nor should it, but the classroom in which lots of different students are doing lots of different things at the same time will be much more in evidence.

It is this combination of a return to electives and a multi-optioned, activity-centered literature classroom that will make the study of literature in the 80's exciting. Add television, movies, and adolescent literature to the mix, and in 1990 I think we'll all be able to say, "Literature study never had it so good."

CHAPTER 3

Language and the English Curriculum

Yetta M. Goodman

To be asked to look into the future of curriculum development in the field of English is exciting and flattering. However, it would be naive for anyone to believe that educational decisions are based solely on professional considerations. Education is a significant institution in our society, and the results and implications of educational curriculum and instruction are inextricably involved with political, social, and economic factors. At any historic point in time, these factors have as much impact on education as do the knowledge and insights coming from the greatest scholars in the educational world. A recent example is the focus on teaching composition because of the "why Johnny can't write" concerns expressed in the popular media.

Yet as I look at the 1980's as an educationist, one who studies education, I want to focus on the educational issues that should have impact on the crucial curricular decisions to be made in the teaching of English. The impact of the other factors I leave to others and to the future.

Three major questions about language and its application to learning experiences must be considered in curriculum development:

1. What do scholars in the field of language *know* that is significant in the development of language curriculum? What is the knowl-

edge available that must be understood in order to build appropriate language curriculum?

2. From the knowledge base, what is necessary for teachers to know and what should be organized in such a way to *teach* to students? What do students need to know about language?
3. How can the curriculum be organized so students *use* language in order to maximize their growth in language use?

It is these three questions that the rest of this chapter will explore.

KNOWLEDGE

The scientific study of language has increased greatly, especially during the second half of the 20th century. Most psychologists and linguists who study the way in which children learn language are amazed at the intuitive knowledge that children have of their own linguistic system by the time they come to school.

The evidence that children develop a systematic approach to language learning is growing not only in the area of oral language development¹ but also in the area of written language development.² Not only do children intuitively know the rule system of the language they speak, but also they generate new language forms when necessary to communicate. Children learn language because of the human need to communicate, to interact, to be social.

Studies of how language changes and of what influences these changes also have provided insight that has impact on teaching. Scientific studies of languages spoken in a wide variety of settings have resulted in strong evidence that all forms of language are well formed and rule governed, that language difference is based on social group membership and not on qualitative differences of language forms. Languages differ from each other as a result of the influence of many societal factors. Regional and geographic isolation and contact cause changes in language. The roles people hold in society have impact on language differences; social status, sex roles, professional positions, and age differences all have impact on language differences and all change from one group to another. Not only do groups of people show language differences but also any one person speaks differently from setting to setting, depending on both the position that the person holds in the social interaction and the degree of formality of the language setting. Such differences have been found in the speech of children as young as six years old when they use different language structures while interact-

ing with four-year-olds when compared to those they use in their conversations with adults.

For educators who are concerned with dialect differences, bilingual education, testing, and evaluation, the knowledge gained from the studies of language variation and change is crucial. We have operated far too long on language myth and elitism. Language power comes not from controlling one single form of a language; language power comes from being flexible with language—knowing which language forms are most appropriate for particular settings and social interactions.

Scholars interested in how humans comprehend text focus on the importance of the interaction between speaker and listener, between reader and writer.³ Both parties are actively involved in language processing. Again knowledge of language is crucial to understanding the complexity of language in use.

Conclusions from studies focusing on instruction in language have raised serious questions about the direct use of instruction to develop greater use of reading and writing, of speaking and listening. Such studies seem to conclude that the more people read and write, or speak and listen, the more proficient they become in that particular aspect of language use. Learning specifics about language such as grammar, spelling, and phonics may improve scores on tests of grammar, spelling, and phonics; however, such learning in and of itself has little impact on improved speaking, listening, reading, and writing in the everyday use of these language processes.

Language has been studied in many separate disciplines. Students of rhetoric, literature, psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, reading, child language, neurophysiology, and linguistics have all been examining the role language plays in understanding their particular fields. In the past decade scholars from these groups have been interacting with each other and asking the kinds of questions that have facilitated interdisciplinary study and research. This interaction must continue in order to amass greater and more useful knowledge about the nature of language—how humans learn it, how humans use it.

At the present time, many unsolved problems persist concerning knowledge in language. As in all scientific inquiry, including language study, as knowledge grows and develops, there are many new questions to be asked and problems to be solved.

Curriculum developers in English education should welcome controversy in the study of language. Techniques need to be developed to involve students at all levels of schooling in inquiry approaches to the study of language. When children and young people can participate in the excitement that language scholars experience when they are in-

volved in the search for answers to as yet unsolved problems, then language study becomes relevant and meaningful.

WHAT TO TEACH

One of the problems that has always faced classroom teachers is, "What do I share with my students about what I know?" Supervisors of student teachers are often amazed to find the pre-service teacher trying to present, on the first day of his or her assignment, everything that was learned in four years of college. Sometimes new lecturers at the college level will present their own notes from their own college classes almost verbatim to classes they are teaching for the first time. It is important to separate what is known about language from what to teach about language.

Simply because pre-service teachers have had classes in linguistics, Shakespeare, composition, and transformational grammar doesn't justify the notion that this, in turn, should be presented to students in elementary and secondary schools.

There are two general areas relating to language that should be part of the English curriculum and should be explored with students: (1) learning about language, and (2) using language. However, the way the exploration is done and the forms and materials used for such exploration should be based on the concerns and interests of and the relevance to the particular students.

The first area, learning about language, would raise to a conscious level the students' intuitive awareness of language. Humans develop insights into their own language system. Learning about language should build and capitalize on the students' already developed knowledge. All students can explore the varieties of language that they hear at home, at school, at recreational centers, on television. They can explore the language that they speak with different people at different times and in different settings.

Rather than telling students what is known about language, a knowledgeable teacher can encourage the students themselves to discover such knowledge by becoming careful observers of language users and by learning to ask thought-provoking questions about how language is learned and used. Once interest has been heightened because of their personal involvement, the students are eager to participate in the use of resources for future study because they are searching for answers to their own questions. Some may be questions that even linguists themselves haven't yet been able to answer very satisfactorily.

Teaching can be developed around incidental settings such as the following. First grader Kay, age six, was playing in the store corner organizing the shelves and prices. She turned to her teacher and said, "Sometimes two s's say *dress*ing and sometimes they say *Russian*." The teacher responded by saying, "Can you think of any other times two s's sound like they do in *Russian*?" Robin, standing by the play register, said, "*Tissue*." At this moment the teacher can go over to the board and list the three words and ask Kay and Robin to keep an eye out for other similar words to add to their list. It is important to organize a classroom in such a way that crucial learnings about language can take place over time. Other students will become interested because Kay and Robin are.

Other language learning experiences are planned as teachers have conferences with students about their writing in order to involve students in editing their own written work.

All these experiences expand the students' knowledge about language. But knowledge alone does not produce competent language users.

LANGUAGE IN USE

Language study in school is very prevalent. Periods are set aside for spelling, phonics, grammar, and vocabulary development. Textbooks and workbooks are used to teach about language. Often readers and literature textbooks are organized to focus on language study rather than to involve students personally in the enjoyment and love of reading.

The ultimate goal of all our language study is to develop proficient users of language. The English curriculum in school should be organized in such a way that the greatest amount of school time is spent on the use of language and only about 25 percent of the time on learning about language. I believe that knowledge about language comes out of its use and should never be a prerequisite to use.

As the same words and phrases are met in different linguistic contexts, their meanings grow and expand. No dictionary study or vocabulary exercise can develop such flexibility.

Curriculum should be developed to involve students in significant experiences with reading, writing, speaking, and listening so that motivation toward language learning is intrinsic and personal.

We need to move away from the old-fashioned notion that struggle and distaste somehow make learning better. Our own personal experi-

ences show us that when we care about what we are learning, the learning is easier and more long lasting.

Teachers need to have knowledge about language but they must also understand how to develop curriculum. Knowledge about language provides teachers with the techniques to help students observe language use, to ask significant questions about language, and to understand the principles and issues surrounding language study. Knowledge about curriculum development provides teachers with the ability to organize experiences and environments so that students discover personal and social reasons for wanting to learn about language and to use language proficiently.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, Roger. *A First Language: The Early Stages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Bloom, Lois. *Language Development: Form and Functions in Emerging Grammars*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1979.
2. Clay, Marie. *What Did I Write?* New Zealand: Heinemann Educational Books, 1975.
- Graves, Donald. "The Growth and Development of First Grade Writers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, Ottawa, Canada, May 1979.
- Read, Charles. *Children's Categorization of Speech Sounds in English*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975.
3. Anderson, Richard; Spiro, Rand; and Montague, William. *Schooling and the Acquisition of Knowledge*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated, Inc., 1977.
- Rosenblatt, Louise. *The Reader, The Text, The Poem*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.
- Goodman, Kenneth. "Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game." *Theoretical Models and Processes in Reading*. (Edited by H. Singer and R. Ruddel.) Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1970. pp. 259-272.
- Kintsch, Walter. *The Representation of Meaning in Memory*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

CHAPTER 4

Holonomic Knowing: A Challenge for Education in the 80's¹

Bob Samples

Holistic and *holism* are words that are becoming increasingly popular in all sorts of circles, ranging from law enforcement to medicine. Education is no exception. To some, *holistic education* is synonymous with *affective education* as envisioned during the 1960's. To others, it is education that embraces the mystical and esoteric traditions of non-Western thought. To still others, it means a traditional curriculum reorganized so as to contain both Latin grammar and meditation.

My interest in holistic education started with curriculum revision efforts in the 1960's. At that time, I was caught up more in technologies and methodologies than in theory. For the past 10 years, my interest has shifted more toward theory than technology. Like most who follow this path, I explored formal learning theory and found it too behavioristic and too technological. I explored cognitive psychology, humanistic psychology, and research in neurophysiology. To get back to the roots of my scientific training, I even explored recent ideas emerging from physics.

Had I returned 20 or even 10 years ago to physics as a guide toward understanding education, I would have moved quickly into the Newtonian world of behaviorism. But now physics is not like that. Newtonian thinking, with its on-off, push-pull mentality, is all but relegated to the museums of physical thought. Quantum and relativistic thinking

dominate the scene. Cut-and-dried data are scarce. Theories are based on patterns of tentative facts. One collection of facts overlaps other collections here and there, so things that wed whole fields of physics together appear more or less as a mosaic. Even matter is now considered to be patterned energy, and not the tidy electrons and protons of Bohr's day.

The exciting and, at the same time, unnerving part of this is what it does to certainty. If physics, the most exact of the sciences, is, in fact, woven together by uncertainty and ambiguity, where does this leave those of us in education and psychology? Strangely, it leaves us right where we always have been. Certainty has never been any ally in the process of education. In fact, it is easy to conclude that every trend toward certainty has made things less certain. More disruption of learning nearly always results from increased attempts to ascertain what is learned—a phenomenon understood long ago in physics as "the uncertainty principle." Observers always affect the phenomena they observe.

In a way that is what this chapter is about. How do I affect that which I observe? Does my perception affect what I see? If so, what are the consequences of how I perceive?

Holism is a perceptual thing. As such, it is also attitudinal. As we explore some thoughts about holonomic knowing, I hope the outcome is clear: far more is included in knowing than is generally supposed. Also, I hope the use of *knowing* rather than *learning* is clear. Knowing is the holistic, nonspecific result of accumulated experience while learning is specific and linked to changes in behavior. Moreover, I will argue that knowing, like the structure of matter, is the result of overlapping patterns of energy-encoded experience in the entire brain as well as in the entire body of each person. The quality we call holonomic knowing is a far more generalized model than the metaphors of circuits or computers or the traditional geographics of memory storage in the brain. Because it is a more generalized model, it provides many more ways to gain access. Thus, teaching for holonomic knowing is far more varied and diverse than ordinary practices.

NEUROPHYSIOLOGY AND HOLISM

In a way that seems puzzling, our culture has remained generally aloof in regard to holistic approaches to education and learning. This has been clear in the way the educational technologies of planning, testing, and evaluation have become more rigorously cognitive in the past several decades. Student learning in such ecologies is judged more and more

on its conformity to the rational-logical modalities of reasoning dominated by symbols.

During the last decade, a growing wave of investigation in neurophysiology has emerged that has brought this one-sided focus into question. Brain researchers such as Roger Sperry, Joseph Bogen, and Michael Gazzaniga have begun gathering an intriguing base of data that suggests clearly that there are multiple modalities of knowing. Moreover, these various modalities are to a large extent separated in opposite sides of the cerebral cortex.

The findings of these researchers, as well as those of dozens of others, have supported the notion that the cerebral cortex may be seen as divided into hemispheres. These hemispheres are separated by a thick bundle of nerve fibers called the *corpus callosum*. The left hemisphere frequently specializes in the performance of rational, logical, sequential, and time-ordered tasks; the right hemisphere performs the complementary functions that are analogical, metaphoric, intuitive, and spatio-visual.

Research further indicates that these lateralized hemispheres can function synchronously. They support each other and, in fact, are highly dependent on each other. While it is simplistic to talk of left-brained or right-brained persons, it is clear that one's experience, described as *learning style*, may frequently favor one learning ecology over another. Further, it is clear that the process of education in contemporary American society favors one modality over the other.

Though more will be said later about instruction, it should be noted that most educational technologies are created to further left-brained wisdom. Yet, it is apparent to nearly all researchers in this area that the *whole* brain learns during the process of education. While the formal structure of language—its spelling, grammar, and logic—is in residence in the left hemisphere in most people in our Western society, its tonality, its rhythm, and its very song are in the right hemisphere. One cannot effectively teach the left without the right.

The single most important implication of this research is that in the normal brain, each hemisphere is a complement to the other. Each hemisphere is also an access route to the other. The historical overindulgence in left-hemisphere-mode teaching emphases has slighted what can be—and possibly must be—an overwhelming ally in instruction and learning.

There is little doubt that these ideas provide fruitful implications for education. However, the hazards are just as real. It is easy for the uninitiated to cry for the lateralization data to be proof of dichotomization. Both David Galin and Robert Ornstein have urged caution in

regard to the runaway tendency for those who view the lateralization data base as substance for dichotomies. The dichotomy—the on-off, black-white, love-hate contexts—is deeply engrained in Western philosophical traditions as well as in Judeo-Christian religious traditions. Even those who popularize the ideas of lateralization must admit that, although critical functions are specialized in one or the other of the hemispheres, there is a latent residue of the experience related to that function in the whole brain. In other words, all human experience encodes itself into the whole brain, but, as I will suggest later, it is encoded in different modes of knowing.

In educational research and other cultural settings, it is clear that the medium used to retrieve that encoded experience determines which hemisphere tends to respond. If I ask about a rose in language, the language-dominant hemisphere (typically the left hemisphere) provides the dominant response. If I ask a visual question about roses, the visual hemisphere (typically the right hemisphere) has the primary tendency to respond. The issue becomes even more complex if I ask for smells, colors, textures, and metaphors about roses. "Roseness" is clearly encoded throughout the entire brain.

THE HOLOGRAPHIC BRAIN

Karl Pribram, a neurophysiologist at the Stanford Medical School, has moved with grace beyond this classical paradox exemplified by the dichotomous hemispheres. Some of his work has involved the surgical removal of large portions of the cerebral cortex because of tumors or malignancy. Pribram became fascinated with the completeness of recovery of many of the patients after this assault on their brains. He discovered that even after areas of the brain that had specialized in certain functions had been removed, the "knowledge" related to that specialized function seemed to permeate the whole cortical area. As his research continued, it became clear that nearly all the missing cortical functions could be reinstated *if* the rest of the brain could be encouraged to cooperate in submitting its knowledge regarding the missing functions.

Pribram quickly recognized that a dichotomous model couldn't work. It was clear that the cerebral cortex acted far more like a holistically integrated system than like a pair of differently labeled storage bins. He began a search for a model that was not inherently biased against this holism. His choice was to move toward the theoretical model of the hologram.

Pribram is using the hologram as his primary metaphor. A hologram is a physical system in which optical data are stored nearly homogeneously throughout the medium. This means that one can view what appears to be a still "photograph" from different angles and get quite different perspectives. Moreover, high-quality holograms can contain motion so that the pictures seem to move as one views them from different vantage points. The most significant aspect of this metaphor is that a hologram can be chopped up and viewed with magnification; each fragment contains the majority of the optical information of the entire hologram. Pribram finds this a good metaphor to describe how the brain works.

For example, if a hypothetical patient has that portion of the left cortical hemisphere removed that had specialized in the spelling, classification, and pronunciation of the flower *rose*, then those modes of knowing about *rose* would at first appear to be lost. Yet, if a wider array of ways of knowing about *rose* is appealed to, it becomes clear that the patient knows a great deal about *rose*. In other words, the logical *rose* might be lost—but the experiential *rose* still permeates the rest of the brain.

The holographic model is much richer than the lateralized model, without rejecting the data base of lateralization. For example, there is no denial in the holographic model that there are tendencies for certain functions to be carried out by either the right or the left hemisphere. But clearly the holographic model is more closely related to the whole experience that is encoded in the entire brain, rather than the specifics of the mental media used in the processing. The lateralized model has a tendency to emphasize the specific modality of processing experience in the brain, rather than stressing the completeness with which the whole brain synthesizes the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects of the experience.

ADVANTAGES OF THE HOLONOMIC MODEL FOR EDUCATION

The primary advantage of the holographic or, as I prefer, holonomic model is that it creates a mindset of completeness rather than fragmentation. For example, assume that a person has undergone brain surgery and is entering a rehabilitation program. If this person's therapist assumes that certain memory banks have been removed from the brain, then the tendency is to focus on what is *not* there. Such is generally the case with those who use fixed models of brain function. The holonomic

model is much more dynamic. With holonomic knowing, experience is not stored in specific locations in the brain. Rather, it is woven into shimmering patterns of neural energy throughout the brain. Removing a portion of the brain only removes a portion of the pattern. The holonomically oriented therapist gives attention to the pattern rather than to the locus of surgery. In other words, one model biases an observer to focus on *what is no longer there*, while the other model encourages her/him to focus on *what is still there*.

Therapy through use of the deficit model requires an intensive, highly focused reconditioning of specific lost skills. Therapy through use of the holonomic model involves a celebration of those remaining portions of the patterns of knowing that support the experience surrounding lost skills.

The implications of the holonomic model for education are obvious. If we think that human thought is reductive and guided by deficit qualities, then we will educate in that way. We will teach in increments using specific media. We will test and evaluate on narrow parameters of human experience. If a child does not learn at a rate we prescribe, then we intensify the child's exposure to that specific skill or knowledge base.

This is in contrast to holonomic methodologies. In these, the focus is on the celebration of the pattern of knowing that surrounds specific experience. Skills are approached in context. Teachers would view the whole mind as an access route for the expression of the child's wisdom. Teaching would increase access to the holonomic patterns of the child's past and present experience.

Lest this sound romantic, it would be well to recall that models in the mind influence perception awesomely. A physicist, looking at the universe through the models of Isaac Newton, can never see what Einstein saw. Newtonians search for straight lines in curved space.

Ken Peterson, now at the University of Utah, is one of the finest teachers I have ever met. He once told me, "Teaching is easy if you assume that each student already knows all that they need to know to be here." At first, I took this to be a glib witticism. Now, however, I see it as a profound insight into the foundations of holonomic perception. To Ken, teaching is the act of celebrating a student's patterns of inherent wisdom to higher levels of richness.

Peterson never sees learning disabilities; he sees learning assets. Children with immature skills have less apparent arrays of maturity in other characteristics. It is these areas of maturity that he sees and honors. No one can comfortably explain why, but when students' true assets are honored, the areas of less maturity gradually vanish.

HOLONOMIC KNOWING AND WHAT'S RIGHT

Perhaps one of the real mistakes we have made is to allow our culture to become so problem oriented. When people are problem oriented, they are trained to see things that are wrong. Problem-seekers are generally reductionists. Once I overheard one such problem-seeker say, "Every kid in this room has a problem—and I'm going to find out what it is!" The reductionist therapist, like the reductionist teacher, has a tendency to focus on deficits. Each becomes a specialist in the diagnosis of deficit qualities. Each learns to seek and see what isn't there . . . each looks for what is wrong, not for what is right.

Holonomic knowing pushes "what is wrong" into the arena of last resort. When a teacher begins instead with "what is right," those things that can be considered as wrong by some have the tendency to correct themselves with minimum intervention. The holonomic model of mind assumes a resonant synchrony among all of the aspects of a person's experience. A good metaphor might be that of an ecosystem in nature. When the millions of various elements of an ecology function, they function in harmony. If an imbalance emerges, then the deviation corrects itself and returns to normal. Yet in nature, what is normal? Often ecologies respond to imbalance by shifting normalcy to a new kind of equilibrium. Things change, but, in terms of equilibrium, they stay the same.

The holonomic model changes our perception of most learning disabilities as well. A person is generally diagnosed and designated *learning disabled* on the basis of performance criteria. Once a disability is discovered, there is often a tendency to focus or specialize the student's experience so as to increase her or his exposure to the diagnosed deficit. This is in contrast to a more holistic approach that would support and extend the variety of access routes to the areas of competence that the student has surrounding this so-called deficit. Because disability specialists have a tendency to limit rather than extend the varieties of experience, it is possible that they cut off access routes toward growth. It is possible that the diagnosis of a learning disability is a statement that reflects the impotence of the diagnostician more than any inadequacy on the part of the learner.

HOLONOMIC MODES: VISUAL, KINESTHETIC, AND AUDITORY

Holistic education, far from being a catchword of the late 1970's, is thus a goal, a mission, a statement of real potential in fulfillment of the whole person. The model is inclusive, not limiting; it encourages a wider, more unified perspective.

In Fritjof Capra's powerful statement, *The Tao of Physics*, we are clearly pushed toward a richer realization that human perspectives related to subatomic physics are transcending Newtonian vision and moving toward a more holistic view. Jonas Salk argues that such holism is, more likely than not, genetically endowed. Holism is not a cliché, but an archetype. It is manifested in the description of mind work offered through the work of Karl Pribram, with the metaphor of the hologram.

My own work, for nearly two decades, has been focused on expanding the array of access routes to knowing in both psychology and education. It is clear, from the results of the exploration of hundreds of investigations, that there is a greater array of pathways into the workings of the mind than might once have been thought.

Visual, kinesthetic, and auditory pathways exist to facilitate reasoning in ways that clearly enhance the classic focus of education, the cognitive skills. Visual, kinesthetic, and auditory modes—far from being frills in the curriculum—have been shown through numerous studies to be highly effective ways for large numbers of children (and adults) to enhance and extend reasoning. In Gresham, Oregon, attention primarily to visual reasoning has significantly improved performance in the three R's. Movement as a legitimate arena of exploration has accomplished equal credibility in Ft. Myers, Florida. Attention to combinatorial and synthetic thought has been accompanied by grade-level leaps in reading and writing ability, evidenced in studies with students using William Gordon's synectics approach.

A view of holistic education seems to be emerging that transcends the perspectives of both the cognitive and the affective disruptions of the 1960's. This view includes more than an honoring of logical maturity simultaneously with affective competence. It seems to involve more than a concern for accommodation to culturally approved reason and emotional competence. Holistic education and holonomic knowing are created from having access to the expression of a variety of modes of knowing as one communicates. By contrast, the narrow parameters of standardized testing provide a far too limited perspective of human capabilities.

Standardized testing can, however, become a facilitator for holistic education. If schools insist on evidenced improvement in standardized test scores as criteria for learning, then let us rush to its accomplishment. If we increase the frequency of visual reasoning, and if we honor body reasoning through movement as in kinesthetics, and if we nurture auditory reasoning—in addition to the more linear and abstract conventional skills—the evidence suggests that performance on standardized tests will improve dramatically.

It is well to emphasize that these modes of experience are holistic.

Visual experience is far more inclusive than verbal. Body movement utilizes the vestibular system, the most forgotten of our basic senses. Jamake Highwater in his excellent book, *Rituals of the Wind*, clearly demonstrates that the philosophy, psychology, and history of Native American peoples are encoded in their dance and rituals of movement. Because the complexity and maturity of this record could not be "read" by Europeans, it was easy to label the people "savages." Similarly, auditory holism goes far beyond listening to formalized verbal and musical input. In a series of investigations I conducted, I found that small children performed admirably in matching photographs of people they did not know to tape recordings of those people talking.

All of these modes—visual, kinesthetic, and auditory, in addition to verbal and abstract—should be utilized in all curricular offerings. The holonomic modes enhance comprehension and performance in all disciplines. My colleagues and I have used these modes with persons from the first year of life to the eightieth. As one might suspect, it is more "normal" for younger children. Yet this does not mean that it is impossible as one gets older. For 10 years, we have offered week-long seminars at the time of the summer solstice. For seven days, we immerse about 60 adults and children in an environment that nurtures more holistic approaches to career, leisure, and personal life. Of the more than 700 persons involved to date, nearly three-fourths have reported job changes, increased creative output, and more capability to "cope." Nearly all report what they perceive to be highly positive changes in their personal life-styles.

Thus, it is clear that the holonomic modes have great power. In the typical public school setting, courses in art, physical education, and music offer the highest probability that holonomic knowing will be experienced. Yet such courses provide no guarantee. Art, music, and physical education classes can be as fascistic as the worst of math and grammar courses. Visual reasoning and visual knowing are different from "art," although the same media are often employed. Kinesthetic reasoning is awesomely different from calisthenics and folk dancing. Auditory knowing and acuity are different from music appreciation.

The creation of holistic education and a curriculum that enhances holonomic knowing is more an issue of attitude than of new materials, new architecture, and new funding sources. The treacherous side effect of demands for higher accountability is that we strip the curriculum of those experiences that do nurture a wider array of holonomic pathways.

Yet it is becoming more and more clear that neurophysiology, physical theory, and macrobiology are leading us toward higher levels of awareness of the interrelatedness of all experience. The brain is a

holonomic system, energy patterns in the very structure of the physical universe are holonomic systems, and the evolution of organic systems is holonomic.

There are many specifics to explore. Yet it seems clear that we, in education and psychology, owe it to ourselves and our students to resist the Newtonian temptations of the past. Our obvious compulsions to diagnose and evaluate are symptoms rather than truths. In far too many cases, the technology of diagnosis and evaluation has taken precedence over humaneness. I have worked with searchers and researchers whose intent was to protect their models, rather than to celebrate the mind.

We can learn to teach . . . in the ways we live. We can celebrate schools that extend experience, rather than reduce it. We can enjoy a unity with nature, with the mysticism of volvox and Andromeda. And we can regain the courage to know that measurement is convenience. We can regain the conviction that there are things we know that need not be measured and, whether measured or not, will continue to exist.

REFERENCE

1. © 1979, Bob Samples. (Printed with permission.)

CHAPTER 5

Oral English and the Literacy Imperative

Marvin Klein

There are at least two fundamental factors that will shape the direction of oral language instruction in the curriculum of the English language arts during the 1980's. One is our increasing understanding of language as "the house in which we live." It shapes in critical ways our sense of self and, even more fundamentally, our ability to get along in the world. A second factor is our heightened sense of community awareness regarding the purposes and directions of public education and the responsibility of the schools for meeting the needs of a contemporary society.

In the case of the first factor, there has been a long-standing tradition of acknowledgment of the role of language generally and of oral language more specifically in shaping our perceptions of reality. Language philosophers as well as classical rhetoricians have long proclaimed the point. And, at least in concept, few have denied its validity. However, it has been only in more recent history that we have extended the functions of oral language to include responsibility for assisting in cognitive growth of the individual. Although language was seen as an accompaniment to such cognitive growth by Piaget and others in the first half of this century, more recent work by developmental and cognitive psychologists and by developmental psycholinguists asserts increased and more subtle roles for language in shaping the intellectual ability of the individual.

We can note, for instance, the long-standing, comprehensive work of the Russian developmentalists during the past 30 to 40 years. Primarily led by Lev Vygotsky and his students, this research in language and cognition has established critical new insights into important relationships between these two modes of action, language and cognition.¹ The general tenor of that work suggests ties between the two modes that are close and largely sustained through the life of the individual. This work has been supplemented in efforts by British sociolinguists, such as M.A.K. Halliday and Joan Tough, as well as by a number of other researchers in this country.

In short, oral language serves purposes perhaps even more basic than being a tool for the transmission of information or a mode of self-expression. And as schooling is forced to redefine roles and responsibilities in the immediate future, this is a point that will assume increasing importance. With a burgeoning knowledge base and more sophisticated technology pressuring the educational system, decisions regarding choices of focus must be made. One most likely alternative will be a continued reduction of emphasis upon knowledge *per se* and more emphasis upon the development of reasoning and thinking skills that are most likely to be useful in processing and monitoring this growing knowledge.

The second factor—heightened public sensitivity to the responsibilities of the schools—is also already being felt in many quarters. Demands for accountability, tightened budgets, critical examination of test scores, and curriculum policy decisions by parents and community representatives could be only a possible beginning which is signaling a new social consciousness. The question of major new societal direction notwithstanding, it is clear that we should anticipate increased community input about curriculum matters in the schools. Federal programs require such involvement and the pattern appears firmly set. Pressures for meeting the most pragmatic of social demands may be anticipated. Amongst the likely pressures are those for increased oral communication skills as an important concern of the English language arts.

Oral language continues to be our primary communication mode. Decisions about us—our personalities, our social and professional competence—are made on the basis of our ability to use this language in oral exchange with others.

Developments then in the English curriculum area will be shaped by two powerful, albeit significantly different, factors. Research and theory are suggesting that oral language is important for learning generally. Social pressure will demand a response to the significant need for effective oral communication skills as prerequisite to personal and economic advancement in our lives.

An emphasis upon oral communication within the English language arts curriculum will represent a fairly dramatic shift from current practices. In their *High School English Instruction Today*, Squire and Applebee observe:

Speech and oral language skills are similarly neglected in the meager 4.9 percent of class time they receive, although teachers agree that they should stress these even at the expense of other activities. One re-emerging pattern is the semester of required speech, usually introduced at the tenth grade level, but in the long run proficiency in oral language cannot be developed through only one semester of work. It requires the continuing attention of the teacher of English at all levels of the high school program and a conscious emphasis on oral activities during other phases of English instruction.²

In spite of their position here, one can observe that in Squire and Applebee's 12 hypotheses of quality English programs, oral communication and/or speech are never referred to—only literature, writing, and language (in the sense of grammar and usage) study are included.

Eight years later, Moffett and Wagner, in *Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13*, suggest:

A critical part of the bias against student language production has been the exclusion or slighting of activities allowing students to use oral language. Like creative writing and journalism, speech and dramatics are gaining ground today as elective courses, sometimes in lieu of a required English course, but in many places they are still exotic options, and seldom are they ever matter-of-factly incorporated into basic language arts at the elementary level or into English at the secondary level.³

Recent reviews of oral language instruction practices in Wisconsin, Washington, and Michigan (1975-1978) reflect much the same pattern.⁴ Approximately 75 percent of the high schools in these three states offer speech communication courses. However, only about one-third of the schools surveyed required such courses. In Wisconsin, where practices in the elementary grades were surveyed, approximately 75 percent of the school districts reported attention to "speech" in grades K-6, and approximately 50 percent included study in "creative dramatics." Only about 25 percent of the reporting districts maintain consistent involvement somewhere in grades K-12 in forensics.

To whatever extent such surveys reflect the state of the curriculum, we may assume that there has not been a dramatic change in the past decade or so in the commitments of public schools to "speech." However, several important things are not revealed in these data. One con-

tinuing unknown is the role of oral language and instruction in its use as part of the broader educational program. How much attention is given to oral language in curriculum areas such as reading, language arts, or social studies, for example, is not at all clear. Also, the role that the contemporary shift in conceptual focus from *speech* to *communications* has played in moving oral language focus to other domains of study is not clear.

In addition, more recent developments, such as the inclusion of oral literacy in the U. S. Office of Education's reorganization of Right to Read to address all key basic skills including oral language facility, have not had time to reshape curriculums in major ways.⁵ Nor, for that matter, has a great deal of contemporary theory and research presented in the professional literature filtered through the implementation process. However, questions that are posed regarding practical problems with oral language are being addressed more fully. For example, instructional areas such as oral language that have not seemed amenable to paper-pencil testing have traditionally been troublesome for schools where accountability and performance have been equated. Now an increasing array of approaches to evaluation and assessment of oral language is becoming available.⁶ In addition, work in developmental psycholinguistics and communications generally has shifted emphasis recently from language parts—words, phrases, sentences in utterances—to larger discourse. Even areas such as reading theory and research are turning to discourse analysis models as more viable routes to improved comprehension as well as to language production.⁷

What we are seeing then are strong indications of movement both within the teaching profession and without to redefine literacy in such a way as to place oral language into a more central area of focus at the same time when oral language is surfacing more conspicuously as a critical force in both cognitive and social development.

Considering factors such as these, the author proposes the following regarding oral language in the English curriculum in the 1980's:

1. A general retrenchment of the English curriculum will continue. Elective programs will be reduced in number, and options within such programs will be cut back. Oral language electives will not suffer, however, as much as electives in areas such as literature. A skill development focus will dominate most elective courses, and language production—talking and writing—will receive a greater portion of total instructional emphasis in systems where the elective approach is strongly entrenched. Overall, however, the more important changes will be subtle in appearance—less

observable even to the outside viewer than to the staff within. These changes are suggested next.

2. The entire approach to instruction in the traditional English curriculum will broaden in perspective. The directions of theory and research, societal need, and a sense of larger community responsibility will place pressures on current curriculum boundaries. The English/speech dichotomy will continue to weaken, and the notion of communication arts will grow progressively stronger. Further, functional competence rather than oral language skill *per se* will be stressed. If there is an overriding notion that will govern the domains of language production and consumption which have traditionally fallen under the aegis of "English," it will be "literacy." Indeed, we may view the 1980's as a decade vested with a "literacy imperative." The primary areas of study will begin to look different from the modes we have become used to—literature, language, and composition, or, for that matter, reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Discourse modes—both oral and written—will more likely be treated in terms of situational context, propositional networks or structures, and cohesion factors, rather than via genre or encoding/decoding type.
3. A K-12 orientation toward the development of oral language (communication) facility will become more dominant. Literacy as a global concept will demand a holistic approach and a developmental bias for effective implementation. And literacy competencies will be seen as more than minimal skills that can be taught in selected high school English or speech courses. The fragmentation of disciplines that share significant responsibilities for developing literacy will become a thing of the past; the more comprehensive perception of the educated individual being fostered by current social and psychological imperatives simply does not allow for the separate goal formulations of disciplines as they have existed in the schools. As pointed out elsewhere in this volume, shrinking enrollments and tightened budgets alone will force retrenchment and coordination of efforts. The solidifying of the efforts of those with responsibility in facilitating oral language might be one of the few positive benefits of factors such as these.
4. The language of instruction and the language of the classroom generally will receive more attention, with staff development becoming a more important feature of the school operation.

Current interest in the reading register of the teacher of reading as it relates to metalinguistic awareness in young children is a good example of the directions being formulated. Young children, for instance, appear not to have mastered the reading register of the teacher—the terms *word*, *letter*, *sentence*, etc.—as soon as we had assumed.⁸ Whether they need to at an early stage is still open to debate. However, the fact that we need to address more specifically the nature of the language of instruction and how the language environment in the classroom shapes learning at all levels is becoming more apparent. The lessons of the Watergate watershed are giving way to a concern for the subtlety and nuance implicit in any language use the primary function of which is management or control. To some extent, at least, management is an important responsibility of the teacher. Hence, the need for a conscious sense of how given speech acts, assertions, and directives shape the learning environment of the class is critical. Current postures assumed both in the literature and by important institutions such as state and federal agencies suggest that the oral language of teaching as well as that of curriculum will assume greater importance in the 1980's. We will be concerned with formulating K-12 oral language curriculums that will develop more effective communication skills, and, in addition, we will place more emphasis on self-examination, attempting, first, to increase our awareness of the impact of the language of instruction and, further, to become more proficient in the use of that language in order to assure more effective learning environments.

The "literacy imperative" is likely to dominate most of public education during the decade of the 80's. In some senses this will require re-examination of the entire K-12 curriculum, not just the area traditionally known as English. Further, it is quite clear that the earlier perception of literacy as the area of those skills related to decoding print or reading is no longer adequate. Any meaningful definition of literacy must include the entire range of language-producing and -consuming skills because literacy, by nature as well as by social demand, is a multimodal concept. An orally inarticulate reader is neither likely nor desirable in these times.

Though global in concern, the responsibility for developing literacy skills will continue to fall upon the shoulders of those who have historically been entrusted with their teaching—the English teacher, the language arts teacher, and/or the speech teacher. The critical difference we

face in the 1980's, however, is that the literacy imperative has behind it a sustained social force shaped by an incredible public commitment and an institutional enforcement potential that have not been present in the past. Such a commitment, coupled with economic factors and continuing research in the functions of oral language, means a new resolve that teachers in traditional structures will have difficulty addressing. Old disciplinary lines must yield and more comprehensive and global stances be assumed.

The potential is great, for although we are finding societal pressure impinging on turf that has historically been ours as classroom teachers, the fundamental decision—whether the literacy we strive for is minimal or optimal, whether it is defined in terms of narrow, disjointed skills or in terms of more functional, comprehensive competencies that give our students the intellectual and linguistic capabilities to shape their futures—is ours to make. And that, in itself, is enough to make the 80's an exciting decade for the teacher of oral communications in our schools.

REFERENCES

1. Vygotsky, L. *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- . *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962.
- Wertsch, J.V., editor. *Recent Trends in Soviet Psycholinguistics*. White Plains, N. Y.: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1978.
- Note also:*
- Bobrow, D., and Collins, A., editors. *Representation and Understanding*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Freedle, R.O., editor. *Discourse Production and Comprehension*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1977. Vol. 1.
- Halliday, M.A.K. *Language As Social Semiotic*. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978.
- . "Learning How to Mean." *Foundations of Language Development*. (Edited by E.H. Lenneberg and E. Lenneberg.) New York: Academic Press, 1975. Vol. 1.
- Kintsch, W., and Van Dyke, T.A. "Toward A Model of Text Comprehension and Production." *Psychological Review* 85: 363-394; 1978.
- Markova, I., editor. *The Social Context of Language*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Norman, D.A., and Rumelhart, D.E., editors. *Exploration in Cognition*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1975.
- Tough, J. *The Development of Meaning*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.
- . *Focus on Meaning*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1973.
- Squire, J.R., and Applebee, R.K. *High School English Instruction Today*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968. pp. 257-258.
- Moffett, J., and Wagner, B.J. *Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976. p. 17.
- Book, C.S., and Pappas, E.J. "The Status of Speech Communication in Michigan Secondary Schools." *Central States Speech Journal* 29: 155-162; Fall 1978.

Nyquist, J.L. *The Status of Speech Communication in High Schools in the State of Washington*. Seattle: University of Washington, Department of Speech Communication, 1976.

Wisconsin Schools Annual Classification Report, 1977-78. Personal communication with Robert Kellner, English Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1979.

5. Boyer, E.L. "Redefining Literacy and Basics Communication: Message Senders and Receivers." *Communication Education* 27: 271-276; November 1978.

6. Larson, C., and others. *Assessing Functional Communication*. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC/RCS, 1978.

7. Research reported in current issues of the *Reading Research Quarterly* and the *Journal of Reading Behavior* are excellent indicators of the contemporary enthrallment with discourse analysis models for theory building and research conduct in reading. Names such as Grice, Coulthard, Kintsch, Frederiksen, Rumelhart, and others are common references in this literature.

8. Holden, M.H., and Ginitie, Mac. "Children's Conception of Word Boundaries in Speech and Print." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 63: 551-557; 1972.

Contemporary interest in notions such as metalinguistic awareness and the role of that awareness in the language of the classroom has increased dramatically. Note especially work by John Downing, Ignatius Mattingly, and Courtney Cazden.

CHAPTER 6

Reading and the Teaching of English

William S. Palmer

In *The Wired Society: A Challenge for Tomorrow*, James Martin emphasizes the influence of electronic devices in our present society:

History can be learned with programs as gripping and informative as Alistair Cooke's *America*. University courses modeled on England's Open University use television and remote computers; degrees can be obtained via television. Computer-assisted instruction, which was usually crude and unappealing in its early days, has now become highly effective. The student watches color film sequences or reads still frames and is asked to respond periodically on a keyboard. His or her response determines what will be shown next. The computer reinforces the material until it is learned. To prepare such programs, there has grown up an industry as large as Hollywood and just as professional. Program production is expensive, but one program is often used by hundreds of thousands of students. You can learn hobbies, languages, mathematics, cooking—all manner of academic and leisure subjects. The world supply of such programs is rapidly growing, and most can be obtained on request on the home communications facilities.¹

Discerning educators realize and accept this trend in these times of automation and technology; much knowledge, indeed, is being acquired through electronic media. This acknowledgment, however, does not mean that the use of print is diminishing in our schools and society. To

the contrary, Kenneth Boulding has referred to this era as a time of printed information "overload,"² and a visit to a well-stocked book store will reflect this point. We now find in print cat calendars, various kinds of crossword puzzles, and "how-to" books—how to play golf, how to sun-tan successfully, how to disco dance, how to cook, how to read palms, even how to get all you want out of life. Then, there are numerous books concerned with physical exercise—bicycling, swimming, sports without pain, the psyche side of sports. Also, we can find the "complete" books—from those on running, walking, and medicine to those concerned with nutrition. In addition, there is a variety of textbooks as well as general information books on such topics as sailing ships, feet, songs, kites, horses, dogs, fishing, insurance, vitamins, babies, careers, piloting, sex, and skin and skin care. And the list goes on and on.

Thus, even in these times of the electronic revolution, print remains another principal source for use in learning. In the 80's, the attention focused upon the need to improve reading instruction at all levels will only continue to increase for many reasons, but primarily because of the two that follow. First, print is a necessary mode for much learning because it possesses its own unique characteristics that preserve and convey information *differently* than do other means of acquiring information.³ Therefore, we cannot assume that the use of print and the use of other methods of acquiring information (such as through electronic devices) can become an either-or choice for all learning tasks. Secondly, more than ever before, there will be ever-developing emphasis on encouraging greater reading flexibility if students are to cope with the continuous accumulation of wide and varied sources of print.

What implications, then, does the preceding perspective of the use of print have for teachers of the 80's? Basically, there are three: (1) the need to achieve as great an understanding as possible of the reading process, and especially of recent psycholinguistic contributions; (2) the need to delineate key limitations of competency-based reading testing movements and, at the same time, to develop some sensible alternatives; and (3) the need to help students succeed in reading many different kinds of printed discourse.

THE READING PROCESS: LINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS

For many years the reading process has been typically defined in relation to a series of diverse skills and subskills through descriptive explanations of their interrelationships. Many definitions of reading, then, are attempts to clarify the reading process by arranging these

skills, primarily of a cognitive kind, in hierarchies which, in turn, are attempts to explain how one skill builds upon the preceding one through a structural arrangement. Because hierarchies provide systematic organization of skills into main categories and subcategories, they are presumed to increase one's understanding of the reading process.

To some extent, this taxonomic viewpoint of the reading process has given us some insight into what happens when one reads. But the preceding description of reading is much too simplistic, limited, and mechanistic. As Arthur Gates said years ago:

Reading is not a simple mechanical skill; nor is it a narrow scholastic tool. Properly cultivated, it is essentially a thought process. However, to say that reading is a "thought-getting" process is to give it too restricted a description. It should be developed as a complex organization of patterns of higher mental processes. It can and should embrace all types of thinking, evaluating, judging, imagining, reasoning, and problem-solving. Indeed, it is believed that reading is one of the best media for cultivating many techniques of thinking and imagining.⁴

In this definition of reading, Gates identifies elements involved in the reading process that are more complex than those identified and discussed in most taxonomic models. Not only does he list an array of diverse types of thought but also he considers both cognitive and affective factors in reading. But Gates' definition omits a most significant element in the reading process, one that of late has increased our understanding of this complex process. The missing element is *language*.

Through relatively recent research findings, we now know that reading involves both language and thought. And Gates' perception of the reading process, similar to taxonomic models, fails to deal with language, how it is structured, and how it is patterned in different modes of printed discourse. Thus, taxonomic insights into the reading process frequently fail to suggest both how words and syntactic structures come to be associated with comprehension and how the reader, in turn, processes information. Our increased understanding of reading as both a thought process and a language process has come primarily from the fields of psychology and linguistics.

Recent developments in psycholinguistics indicate that theory-based information processing models offer the promise of a clearer and more precise understanding of this complex activity. Combining both language and thought, Kenneth Goodman⁵ psycholinguistically defines reading as "a complex process by which a reader reconstructs, to some degree, a message encoded by a writer in graphic language." Both Goodman⁶ and Frank Smith⁷ theorize that a reader reconstructs a message by making use of both visual and nonvisual information.

Nonvisual information transcends the text or printed material being studied. First, nonvisual information involves the students' ability to conceptualize and the extent of their previous experience in reading, particularly in relation to the topics at hand. Second, nonvisual information involves the students' knowledge of language and their familiarity with the structure and patterns within forms of written discourse.

Visual information, on the other hand, involves other, yet similar, complex strategies of information processing. The redundancies within printed language greatly influence the students' tasks of making correct decoding responses. Redundancy in print occurs at a number of levels. There is featural redundancy in individual letters; for example, some letters are curved while others are straight. The same kind of featural redundancy occurs in words. There is much redundancy within the structure of words because in the English language, patterns of features tend to occur only in certain combinations. These highly consistent patterns of features are examples of *orthographic redundancy*. Redundancy also extends across sequences of words and involves syntactic and semantic constraints. Reading thus comes to be perceived as an activity done to reduce uncertainty in print.⁸

To reduce uncertainty and obtain meaning, readers do not need to make use of all the information available to them. Instead, they take the most direct route and use as few cues as necessary to reach their goal—comprehension. An understanding of language structures and of the fact that every bit of information may be conveyed by several cues makes it possible for readers to predict and analyze the printed grammatical patterns after identifying a few elements within. The context in which the language occurs, created by the previous meanings readers have gathered, allows them to predict meanings that follow. To comprehend during reading, then, students *predict* as they read, *selecting* only the most productive cues and *sampling* the graphic language as they test their predictions. When predictions are not confirmed, readers then engage in greater visual analysis.

The implications of psycholinguistic theories for an increased understanding of the reading process thus become more apparent. Instead of letting students become passive identifiers of letters and words, English teachers of the 80's must encourage them to become active searchers for meaning during reading. We will also need to help students expedite this process. Instead of perpetuating instruction in reading with a set of discrete and fragmented skills, we must help students go directly from graphic language to meaning—without getting needlessly bogged down in the process.⁹

COMPETENCY-BASED TESTING MOVEMENTS: EXPLORING ALTERNATIVES

Among reading authorities, there is much debate concerning what constitutes the reading process and how reading should be taught. Two viewpoints tend to polarize within this diversity. On one hand, some argue for the need for a greater integration of reading with the expressive language arts, for varied and eclectic methods of teaching reading.¹⁰ At the other extreme, many educators and state legislators argue for "minimal" and measurable competencies in reading.¹¹ This latter movement raises two chief concerns: (1) what are some characteristics of tests that are to be used in an attempt to measure minimal reading competency and (2) how are student results on these tests to be interpreted?

Characteristics

In reference to competency-based reading tests, Robert J. Tierney notes the following limitations:

They tend to focus instruction on minimum rather than maximum reading skills.

They tend to be culturally sterile rather than culturally pluralistic.

They erroneously assume that minimum competencies are known, credible, and measurable.

They assume that all individuals acquire the same skills, in the same amount of time, to the same extent, by the same methods.¹²

Tierney, like others who agree with the above, does not negate the need for standards of competence in the teaching of reading. His primary point, nevertheless, is that in no way can a student's performance on these tests be considered a sufficient means of measuring reading competence. Therefore, he concludes:

Legislatively mandated minimal competency testing erroneously assumes that these competencies can be defined for all students, agreed upon by all persons, and measured. Such legislation overlooks the limits and dangers of testing and alternative ways of defining and determining student growth.¹³

Interpretation

The interpretations of competency-based test results have been used recently in many states to determine whether students at certain critical stages in their schooling should be *promoted* or *retained*. Such use—or misuse—of these tests has created much controversy. In the 80's, however, there is the likelihood that the dangers and misuses of compe-

tency-based reading tests will be rectified. There is much potential that local and state agencies will agree with the position adopted and approved recently by the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association:

No single measure or method of assessment of minimum competencies should ever be the sole criterion for graduation or promotion of a student. Multiple indices assessed through a variety of means, including teacher observations, student work samples, past academic performance, and student self-reports, should be employed to assess competence.

Furthermore, every effort should be made through every possible means to remediate weaknesses diagnosed through tests. Retention in grade or non-promotion of a student should be considered as only one alternative means of remediation and one that should be considered only when all other available methods have failed.

For these reasons, the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association is firmly opposed to efforts of any school, state, provincial or national agency which attempts to determine a student's graduation or promotion on the basis of any single assessment.¹⁴

INCREASING READING FLEXIBILITY

Futuristic trends in the uses of print, already noted, suggest that our students will interact with wider and more varied forms of printed discourse than ever before. Consequently, they will need as much experience and assistance in reading information written differently for different purposes. Basically, they will need the capacity to read with ease three primary kinds of printed information: functional, technical, and literary.

Reading Functional Print

Functional reading, sometimes equated with "survival reading," includes tasks from reading calorie-count charts on products in grocery stores to reading various "how-to" manuals. We must not assume, however, that sources of functional reading are always easy to comprehend. In the 80's, English teachers will be using a variety of functional reading materials required within our pluralistic society. Thus, English teachers must become increasingly conscious of those characteristics found within different sources of functional print. Some examples follow: slanted information, false inferences, unproportionate analogies,

and hidden meanings and motives, such as can often be found in the language of advertising or editorials.

Reading Technical Print

Making technical passages simple to read, particularly in content areas, is not an easy task. Teachers interested in improving the teaching of technical reading must keep the following points in mind:

1. Teachers frequently assign great quantities of content that is often highly technical. We must become increasingly conscious of this fact: there is a difference in the ease with which we read different sources of printed discourse. Some forms, like technical expository information, exemplify typically difficult reading information. Moreover, the greater the amount assigned, the greater the reading task becomes for the student.
2. Of much significance in the reading of technical material is the vocabulary load—the kind, number, and frequency of specialized terms used.
3. In order to comprehend technical information in print, the student must be exposed to more than the mere sound and sight of the specialized vocabulary. Equally as significant, each one must understand the concepts behind the technical terms and how they are used in a particular context.
4. The reader of technical information will also need to comprehend the sequencing of events, why they have been so arranged, and why and how the specific and specialized words are used within the different parts of the printed material. In addition, the reader must be capable of perceiving relationships among these elements within the printed structure.
5. Perceiving relationships when reading technical information is difficult because it often involves critical reading skills of the highest order. In reading to gain technical information, the reader has to put many thought processes to work and at many different levels of abstraction.

At times, the student will need to do more than *analyze* and *discriminate*, although frequently, and sometimes simultaneously, she or he will need to perform these basic mental activities.

In the 60's, more than ever before, teachers will need to become increasingly aware of their reading assignments by asking themselves if they have been *assumptive*. An assumptive teacher assumes that the

reader has already the knowledge and experience background required to understand the content in print. In a similar fashion, teachers will need to become increasingly conscious of writers of materials for students to read who also make similar assumptions—such as that the reader has the same skills of language comprehension as the authors, that the elements and structure of content used by the authors are familiar to the students, and that the students are capable of mastery. Teachers must remember that frequently what the writer takes for granted, the reader has to figure out for herself or himself. The writer of materials for students, then, can choose to present her or his thoughts in any order, but the reader is constrained to the syntactic order through which the writer presents these thoughts.¹⁵

Reading Literature

In the 1970's we became more conscious of the personal, emotional, and social needs of our students, reflected in all media. Current newspapers and magazines now feature articles based upon some of these concerns. To illustrate, read some banner headlines: "Early Pregnancy Looms for Teen-Age Girls"; "Homes Needed for Runaways"; "Teen-Age Son Kills Parent"; "How Teen-Age Con Artists Rob Elderly"; "Pre-Teen Pregnancy—How to Cope"; "Nontraditional Jobs for Girls"; "The Abandoned Child—Single, Searching, Scared"; "Bed-Wetting—Trigger for Child Abuse?" "Course Offered to Help Adolescents Cope While in Prison"; "Teen-Ager Held for Aggravated Kidnapping and Robbery." And the topics continue to abound—dealing also with broken homes, drugs, mental illness, alcohol, death, the occult, and communal living.

Not only must English teachers of the 80's teach literature, but also they must use a variety of literary sources.¹⁶ Sources of literature should include career books, biographies, historical novels, poetry and/or drama, science fiction, fantasy, the classics, high-interest-easy-reading books, and popular materials and magazines. The wide and varied sources of literature must be taught primarily for the following three reasons.

First, *students need to read literature for pleasure and personal involvement.* A major contribution of literature is to help students learn more about the human condition—to help them find their own identity, who and what they are, and what they can become. In literature, students read about characters living through crises. They learn to identify who the other is, and for what he or she stands—his or her reality, then, as an individual.

Second, *students read literature to extend their ability to comprehend and manipulate new concepts and thought relationships.* Within literature, there is much opportunity for thought and concept development; for the awakening of subconscious ideas; for the exploration of new hopes, answers, and feelings. Literature, with its many facets for reflecting life, serves as a source of "reading growth" for our students. Through literature, students gain additional experiences at different stages of their human adventure. Thus, literature supplies the students with much power in reading—power to *extend*, power to *realize*, power to *share*, power to *participate*, power to *experience*, if only vicariously.

Third, *students read literature to transcend the "here and now."* Through literature, students are capable of generating variations in experiences that permit all sorts of concomitant delights. Among an array of characters and situations, they discover those elements into which they can project their own emotions, their own personalities. Through vicarious responses to literature, our students extend full use of images, memories, feelings, and intuitions. When students respond to literature vicariously, they go beyond the "here and now."

Like all teachers in the 80's, English teachers must become increasingly accountable for assisting each student in the mastery of skills needed to comprehend different kinds of printed materials written for different reasons. What we all as teachers must keep in mind, however, is this most important point: *Our students read differently at different times because they read different materials for different reasons. We must also remember that our students read materials written differently in a similar way at times and for similar reasons. For example, they may read any printed matter, whether it be classified as functional, technical, or literary, with varying degrees of cognitive, creative, and analytical thought.* Thus, in planning for improved instruction in reading, we will need to increase our knowledge of what skills seem most appropriate to teach, at what time, with what content, and to which students. We must also continue to offer students opportunities to read with both thought and feeling, with both emotion and interest.¹⁷

The times are ripe for "student centered" reading curriculums in the 80's. Whatever else English teachers decide, we should continue to use the student's *self* as content. Each student's personal contribution to this learning act places reading activities in as broad a context as possible. It is this multifaceted perception of reading that we teachers must possess if we are to teach reading with power. In turn, it is the ability to read with such power that our students need and deserve—and not a bit less.

REFERENCES

1. Martin, James. *The Wired Society: A Challenge for Tomorrow*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978. p. 9.
2. Boulding, Kenneth. Speech presented at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978.
3. Palmer, William S. "Reading: A Unique Mode for Learning." *English Journal*, March 1979. p. 30.
4. Gates, Arthur. *Reading in the Elementary School*. Forty-Eighth Yearbook, Part II, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949. p. 17.
5. Goodman, Kenneth. "Behind the Eye: What Happens in Reading." *Reading: Process and Program*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970. p. 5.
6. ———. "Psycholinguistic Universals in the Reading Process." *Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. (Edited by Frank Smith.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973. pp. 21-27.
7. Smith, Frank, editor. *Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
8. Palmer, William S. "Reading—A Thought and Language Process." *The High School Journal*, January 1976. pp. 50-59.
9. ———. "Defining Reading in Proper Perspective." *Applied Linguistics and Reading*. (Edited by Robert Shafer.) Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1979.
10. Stauffer, Russell G. *Teaching Reading as a Thinking Process*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
11. Moffett, James, and Wagner, Betty Jane. *Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.
12. McDonald, Thomas F. "Pro: Minimal Competency Testing as Viewed from the Front Line." *Journal of Reading*, October 1978. pp. 13-15.
13. Tierney, Robert J. "Con: Minimal Competency Testing Won't Do It." *Journal of Reading*, October 1978. pp. 10-12.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
15. *Reading Today*. IRA Newsletter. Newark, Del., June 1979. p. 1.
16. Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971. pp. 12-13.
17. Varlejs, Jana. *Young Adult Literature in the Seventies*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow-Press, Inc., 1978. p. 2.
18. Palmer, William S. "Teaching Reading for Power—Cognitively, Creatively, and Analytically." *English Journal*, September 1976. p. 45.

CHAPTER 7

The Basics in the 80's

Gary Tate

To think back over the changing face of English studies during the 1970's is to become aware of the folly of prediction. How many of us, in 1969, foresaw the changes that were to occur during the next decade, changes such as those described so well by Vernon H. Smith in the April 1979 issue of *The English Journal*? How many of us, in 1969, would have predicted a back-to-the-basics movement that has affected almost every educational institution in this country? How many of us would have understood the force with which the so-called "new vocationalism" has diminished the prestige of the various liberal arts curriculums? How many of us would have foreseen the nationwide outcry for competency testing at all levels of education? These questions could be continued almost indefinitely, but I need not belabor the obvious.

Some teachers probably saw *some* hints, in 1969, of things to come, but most of us were caught unaware. Why? In part, at least, we ourselves are to blame. We become so engrossed in the day-to-day problems that face us as teachers that we forget our past and have no time (we say) to think about the future. And so we muddle along, day by day, until we find ourselves in the middle of an educational change that we might have been prepared for, had we occasionally looked back and ahead as well as just down. I am not suggesting that we should be able to foresee every slight shift in the educational winds. I argue only that

without a sense of where we have been and without an interest in the future, we as teachers are doomed to a life of surprises, many of which will make little sense and many of which will disturb or even anger us.

I am aware that changes occur as a result of events (political, social, technological) over which we as individual teachers have little control. And these events sometimes have a significant impact on whom we teach, how we teach, and where we teach. Therefore, we must all not spend the best parts of ourselves striving after certainties, tranquility, and permanence in our professional lives. We must, in other words, live in a world in flux, teach in a world in flux. Seen or unforeseen, change will come. The trick, of course, is somehow to avoid letting our changing world so confuse us that we lose sight of what it is that we are about as teachers of English. Or, to put it another way, we must decide what is essential, what is "basic," and so study and teach that; no matter what changes occur, we continue to focus on what should be our central concerns.

I do not know what will happen in the world, in our profession, during the 1980's. I do know, however, that what is basic now will remain basic because beneath the shifting surface of social change, technological change, and pedagogical change, there lie certain fundamental, essential concerns that all English teachers should hold in common. To describe or define these features of our discipline in detail is difficult, but I think it essential that we all try to do so, for without a firm sense of who we are and what our jobs are as teachers of English, we are doomed to be swept along unthinkingly as new waves of teaching methodologies, "innovations," and technologies toss us about from term to term, from year to year.

I would suggest, first, that most of the changes that are likely to occur in the 1980's will have to do with matters of less than primary importance. This has been true in the recent past, and I see no reason to suggest that things will be different—except on the surface—during the decade of the 80's. Being an optimist, I find it, of course, almost inevitable that new and significant ideas about the teaching of writing, literature, and language will surface during the next few years. It is also inevitable that new instructional techniques will be introduced as we learn more about how children and adults learn. What we test and how we test will continue, I think, to be an issue of heated debate. Speculation about most of these matters will appear in other essays in this book. But I would hope that all such changes and debates will not distract us from our essential task, our basic job. Our profession would be healthier today had we not, in the past, been mesmerized by secondary matters, matters that have too often sapped our strength and weakened our

spirits. Not that some of the issues, theories, and problems were not important. They *demand*ed our attention, but not our *entire* attention. We should always save the better part of ourselves for those basic matters that I am suggesting will not change.

To be specific, our essential job as English teachers is to help students find that reading is both profitable and fun, to help students learn something about their language, and to help students become better writers and speakers. No matter what happens during the 1980's, these objectives should remain constant and should engage most of our time and as much energy as we can muster. Whatever distracts us from these basic tasks should be avoided—or should engage as little of our attention as possible. Each of us should ask again and again: What am I doing as a teacher that is not *directly* related to helping students read better, write better, and/or speak better?

Let me now suggest some of the good things that might happen during the 1980's in each of the areas I've mentioned: literature, composition, and language. All that we simply wish for will not come to pass, but if we both hope and work, much can be done.

The study of literature at all levels of education will, I think, become more personal. More and more students and teachers will begin to see literature of all kinds as a transaction between author and individual reader, a transaction in which every reader's response is unique—and to be respected. It will become unfashionable, I hope, for teachers to believe that one "right response" is the only acceptable response to a piece of writing. At the same time, the study of literature just might become something more than the study of literary history, of the lives of famous authors, of the meanings of technical terms. What might happen, if we are all wise enough, is that literary studies in the 1980's will focus on the reading of individual works of merit in such a way that students become better readers, not better literary historians, not better test takers, not better writers of "research" papers. I spoke of reading as profitable and enjoyable, but the two cannot be separated or set in sequence. For some readers, the enjoyment derives from the profit; for others, the profit derives from the enjoyment. And we cannot, should not, define either term in an attempt to make it apply to all students. If, as we so often claim, we respect the individuality of each student, then we should show our belief in this individuality by respecting, listening to, and discussing students' reactions to the literature that they read, even when these reactions seem to us naive or idiosyncratic. Above all, we should stop labeling student responses as "wrong."

An increasing national interest in doublespeak, disclosure, and the English language as a tool of manipulation will cause us, during the

coming years, to examine our language in order to discover more than the eight parts of speech. I do not wish to get involved in the continuing controversy about the merits of various grammatical systems, nor do I think this is the place to do more than predict that the relationship between the study of grammar and the study of writing will remain a healthy controversy during the 1980's, a controversy that will not, I think, be resolved during this decade. I would suggest, however, that more and more excellent teachers, from the elementary grades through graduate school, are realizing that the study of our language can be fascinating to students if that study involves more than the study of grammar. Many students are fascinated by the history of our language and by the ways in which a knowledge of that history affects attitudes about present-day English. As students from different cultures and subcultures intermingle in our classrooms, dialect study will become increasingly dramatic and essential. How human beings acquire language is a topic of central interest to those of us who are interested in helping students read better, speak better, and write better. Language acquisition is, in addition, a fascinating topic in its own right. It is entirely possible, therefore, that during the 1980's more and more of us will begin to see the value of a language study that is far more than the study of grammar. And we need not wait until students are in high school or college to begin this study. The earlier, the better.

Nothing in education during the past few years has been more dramatic than the nationwide interest in the teaching of writing. This interest will continue and possibly show increased intensity during the 1980's. We will, I think, see more clearly than ever before that it is the job of every teacher to help students improve their writing. While the heaviest burden will continue to fall on the teacher of English, there will be a growing awareness that the English teacher cannot "do it all." But we can and will do much. We will, I hope, begin to see—as many see already—that the effective teaching of writing involves more than a term paper, a unit on grammar, and complaints about the illiteracy of students. An increasing number of schools will work, during the 1980's, to provide all students with opportunities to write often and in a variety of modes. Students in English classes who are asked to write only about literature and only in "formal" prose are denied the opportunities necessary to gain that flexibility of thought and style so characteristic of good writers. Frequent writing—of all kinds—will also free many students from their fear of writing, a fear that makes the putting of words on paper a slow and painful experience.

If teaching loads do not decrease during the 1980's—and I doubt that they will—how will all this writing get evaluated, marked, and

graded?¹ Our profession has struggled with this problem for many years now. I hope that in the next decade or so, the question will seem less important, not because teachers will have fewer students in their classes but because we will come to realize, as some do already, that people write to be read, to be heard, not to be evaluated and graded. Teachers who assign only the amount of writing that they can "mark" thoroughly are doing a great disservice to their students. It has been said many times before, but I will repeat it: all papers need not be analyzed for every error; all papers need not be graded. If students know that what they write is being read, most will be satisfied—and many will be delighted. Grades must be given, of course—at the end of term. In the meantime, both students and teachers should be engaged in the frequent writing of many short pieces of discourse so that students will learn to write to be read, not to be graded.

To many readers, my predictions, my hopes, for the 1980's will seem terribly old-fashioned. But that, of course, is just the point. What is *really* basic, as we are fond of saying—reading, speaking, and writing—will not, I think, change during the 1980's or after. In spite of all attempts to add to or ignore one or more of these concerns, in spite of all attempts to redefine "English" and the role of the English teacher, these three basic concerns abide. And they are sufficient.

REFERENCE

1. Editor's Note: The annual NCTE publication *Classroom Practices in Teaching English* focuses on how to deal with the paper load in its 1979-80 edition.

CHAPTER 8

English in the Elementary School: What, How, and Why We Teach

Iris M. Tiedt

The elementary teacher holds a key position in the total English language arts curriculum because it is during these early years that attitudes and basic understandings are first established. The philosophy of instruction adopted by each teacher, whether implicit or explicit, therefore, is of crucial concern as we consider development of English instruction in the 80's. Rational unification of theory and practice is essential for a healthy English language arts curriculum—one that demonstrates awareness of the reality of children's needs, how learning really takes place, and what knowledge will prepare young people for the future.

REVIEWING THE ASSUMPTIONS

Elementary teachers can identify a set of common instructional beliefs based on their knowledge and training, their own sensitivity to the problems that influence both teacher and student, and their personal desire to improve English language arts instruction. Most teachers would agree on the following basic assumptions:

1. The teacher is the key to what happens in the classroom. Students respond to the teacher's enthusiasm, and they want the

teacher's approval. The teacher determines what is taught, and his or her expectations often influence what children achieve. What teachers actually *do* in the classroom reveals their beliefs about teaching.

2. Much learning takes place before children enter school. Children's language development and experiential background begin at birth so that they come to school with knowledge and skills that can be built on. The hours spent outside the classroom continue to offer resources that add to the richness of the curriculum.
3. Language skills are not learned in isolation. The primary skills of listening and speaking provide a foundation on which successful writing and reading depend. Not only is writing, the most difficult of the language skills, supported by oral language, but also it is closely allied to reading through the encoding-decoding processes as well as through the writer-reader relationship.
4. Language skills are used throughout the school curriculum. Listening, speaking, writing, and reading are ways of learning and responding to new experiences and information developed in conjunction with content from history, art, music, mathematics, and science.
5. Students learn by doing. They must write in order to learn to write and read in order to learn to read. If students are to listen, speak, read, and write effectively, the teacher must involve them in language activities that have real purpose, and the purpose for each activity should be clear to the students.
6. Children have a natural love of language. Teachers can promote this enjoyment of language and use it to motivate students as part of a language arts curriculum that includes word-play as well as the more serious study of language structure (grammar).
7. The learning of language begins as a self-motivated activity and should proceed in this way. Essential to the concept of self-motivation is the role of self-evaluation.
8. Children need to feel successful in what they undertake and to know that what they produce is acceptable. Positive reinforcement helps children develop a positive self-image and feelings

of self-esteem. Secure in the knowledge that they are accepted, children can continue to grow.

9. The needs and abilities of individual children differ. Concern for the individual means that we must recognize different modes of learning and provide for alternative choices. Individualized instruction includes opportunities to work alone as well as to interact as part of a group.
10. The teacher's most appropriate role is that of a guide, a facilitator of learning. Rather than closely supervising student activities, the teacher should plan the curriculum and devise strategies that teach students to operate independently.
11. Learning such broad skills as composition and comprehension is more important than mastery of facts. Covering content will, therefore, be secondary to developing student abilities to compose, synthesize, and evaluate or to understand, analyze, and generalize.
12. Parents can play an active and beneficial role in the schooling of their children. Although teachers can provide expertise and guidance for parents, both teachers and parents should work cooperatively for the good of the individual child.

If we accept these 12 basic assumptions about language arts instruction, then it follows that we will design a curriculum that carries out the implications of each one.

DESIGNING A LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM FOR THE 80's

Curriculum is never created in a vacuum. Influenced by societal trends, new research findings, and changing values, language arts instruction will change inevitably as a result of forces that exist both inside and outside of the classroom. Educators need to recognize these influences and to evaluate what they have to offer in terms of curriculum development rather than to permit change to occur without question. At a time when teachers must assume a leadership role in designing a curriculum that reflects what they believe about teaching children, they are faced with the paradox posed by Margaret Mead:

We are now at the point where we must educate people in what nobody knew yesterday and prepare in our schools for what no one knows yet, but what some people must know tomorrow.¹

Setting Goals

The goals for a language arts curriculum in the 80's should be based on the beliefs identified above. These goals will center around the needs of children in a changing society with emphasis on skills and knowledge that will prepare young people for living in the twenty-first century. These goals can be expressed in terms of two basic processes: (1) thinking and (2) communicating.

Thinking. The primary focus of the language arts program for the 80's must be on thinking. Although this language process is subsumed in everything we do, it is often ignored as educators compose lists of proficiencies to be attained by students. A language arts curriculum that focuses on thinking will stimulate questioning and experimenting. It will teach children to respond to the world thoughtfully.

As children endeavor to comprehend the world around them, they will respond to new experiences and discover the excitement of dealing with ideas. They will learn to analyze as well as to synthesize as they integrate affective and cognitive aspects of learning. Our aim should be to bring these modes of learning closer together for, as Piaget observed, they cannot be separated:

Affective life, like intellectual life, is a continuous adaptation, and the two are not only parallel but interdependent, since feelings express the interest and values given to actions of which intelligence provides the structure.²

Communicating. The second focus of language arts instruction must be on communicating, a primary purpose of language. Children of all countries eagerly acquire language as they struggle to speak to those around them. They learn to communicate through attentive listening followed by self-motivated, immediately reinforced practice in speaking. Much later, they learn to communicate through the complex skill of writing.

Children who communicate effectively recognize their own worth and have strong feelings of self-esteem. Accepting themselves prepares them for accepting others as they learn to appreciate the similarities as well as the differences among individuals. The productive side of communication—talking and writing—permits children to share their personal feelings and observations with peers. Through listening and reading (the receptive skills), they hear the voices of others like themselves who share universal problems and concerns. They discover the excite-

ment and challenge of interacting at a personal level and later extend their communication skills to reach a broader audience.

Communicating is, of course, directly related to thinking, since we can express only what is stored in our brains. Inadequate vocabulary and concept development limit what children can think and, therefore, what they are able to communicate. As we consider goals and objectives for communicating, therefore, we will find that they must be closely integrated with those specified for the thinking process and will, in many cases, involve "feeding the brain."

Stating Goals. Children learn through experience, developing language competencies under such broad categories as valuing, describing, relating, discriminating, generalizing, and judging or evaluating. Students will apply these competencies as they think about what they hear and read, and their responses will require the use of oral or written language. Responses to literature, for instance, might be expected to occur in this way:

Valuing: Students will state what they like or admire and what they reject in the literature as they explore varied content and different genres.

Describing: Students will identify and describe such elements of literature as character, setting, plot development, point of view, and dialogue which will serve as models for their original composition.

Relating: Students will make connections, see similarities, and relate literature to their own lives as they share the emotions expressed by a character or observe a different family's way of living.

Discriminating: Students will identify and discuss differences, for example, in the behavior of two characters or the handling of a topic by several authors.

Generalizing: Students will state concepts abstracted from literature such as the universal need for love or the perception of death as part of life.

Judging: Students will evaluate the content or writing style of specific selections as they compare and contrast or argue their own points of view.³

Such goals encourage the development of broad proficiencies that will last a lifetime. Whether we reach our goals will be determined by the subject matter we teach and by the strategies we employ for teaching that content.

Focusing on Concepts and Skills

Determining the concepts to be taught and the skills to be developed in the elementary language arts program brings us to the examination of English as a subject of study. Clearly, there is a body of information related to the English language itself and to products based on language—that is, books, speeches, dramas, and films. In addition, there is a body of information related to languaging skills which require practice if performance is to be adequate.

Certainly, time must be allocated to the study of language, literature, and information about using language with the greatest effect. The study of this content, moreover, provides the vehicle for practicing the most effective use of language.

The English Language. Children who are studying English should learn the fundamental aspects of its structure: phonology, morphology, and grammar. *Phonology*, the study of the sounds English speakers use as they speak, forms the basis for the encoding-decoding process as students relate sounds to the symbols we use in written language. *Morphology*, the study of meaningful elements of language, is essential to the composition and comprehension of both spoken and written language. And *grammar* tells students how English speakers assemble words to compose both oral and written sentences.

In addition to these basic elements, we need to stress a variety of interesting aspects of language that will make its study appealing to young people:

1. *Dialectology*: Regional vocabulary and pronunciations; bidialectalism; the concept of standard English; comparing American and British English
2. *History of English*: Beginnings of the language; relationship to other languages; origins of English words; changing spellings; linguistic change
3. *Usage*: Conventions of using English; levels of appropriateness; developing an "ear for language"
4. *Semantics*: Denotation and connotation; using a thesaurus; the effect of context on meaning
5. *Body language*: Meaning without words; cultural variations; conventional gestures; intonation
6. *Wordplay*: Puns, epithets, euphemisms, onomatopoeia, alliteration, rhymes, word games.

Literature. Children's literature offers a rich store of enjoyment and information. Literature is more than books written for children. It takes many forms and can be experienced through all of the senses. To guide children in exploring such a breadth of content and to enable them to experience literature to the fullest, we must select from thousands of picture books, poetry books, novels, and biographies that are available today. We must also plan to take advantage of literature's stimulus to learning as children discuss books, write dramatizations, read aloud together, view films, and compose music to accompany a favorite poem.

Language Processes. Not only do children need to practice using language skills, but also they need information about how to improve their language abilities. In order to learn how to speak any language, there is no doubt that you must practice speaking it, and the same is true of learning to read and write a language. Students need to discuss their own use of language, the problems they encounter, and how they can overcome these difficulties. For example, admitting the difficulty of writing (handling the conventions as well as the physical act of handwriting) may enlighten both teacher and student as they work together to facilitate the writing process.

Children should be aware, furthermore, of the interrelationships among the language arts. Knowing how speaking and listening are related may clarify the students' effective use of these skills. Students should also realize that oral language provides a strong foundation for their learning to read and to write.


Selecting Teaching Strategies

The instructional strategies selected by teachers determine the strength of any language arts program. The strategies described here have been selected because they reflect the assumptions about teaching discussed earlier, and, furthermore, they will continue to be effective in the 80's and beyond.

Reading Literature Aloud. Picture a teacher reading *Pippi Longstocking*, *Homer Price*, or *Charlotte's Web* aloud to a group of children. All eyes are on the teacher. The students respond appropriately as the story progresses. There is a sigh of regret as the teacher closes the book. This familiar activity is widely used, particularly by primary grade teachers, to add pleasure to the elementary curriculum. As an outstanding teaching strategy, however, its potential has yet to be fully realized, for as teachers read aloud, they are teaching—

1. *English grammar*: Varied sentence patterns.
2. *Vocabulary*: New words in context.
3. *Composition skills*: Imagery, dialogue.
4. *Literature concepts*: Characterization, plot development.
5. *Listening skills*: Comprehending spoken language.
6. *Cognitive skills*: Making inferences, drawing conclusions.

Centering on Composition. Based on a strong oral language foundation and using literature as a stimulus and source of information, the teaching of writing provides an exciting focus for the integrated language arts curriculum. The following holistic model, designed for K-12 levels, provides a framework for the curriculum*:



Students learn the technical skills of writing (mechanics and spelling) and tips for improving their own writing as they are engaged in the writing process. They become involved in producing writing before focusing on style and before learning to edit and revise their first drafts. Sample activities for each stage of development include:

1. *Oral language facility*: Storytelling; asking questions; acting out
2. *Writing fluency*: Making lists; keeping journals; writing personal anecdotes
3. *Narration—story*: Writing dialogue; experimenting with point of

view; creating a children's book; examining the work of noted authors

4. *Exposition—statement*: Topic sentences; expository paragraphs; letters; the I-search paper
5. *Sentence building*: Grammar of the sentence; sentence-combining; style
6. *Word choices*: Accepted usage; connotation—denotation; word-play
7. *Editing*: Use of proofreading marks; reading aloud to check grammar; peer evaluation
8. *Rewriting*: Preparing to make writing public on the bulletin board, in magazines; sharing with parents.

Implicit in this approach are the facts that students should write frequently and for varied audiences and that they should be involved in evaluation.

Developing a Literature Program. A literature program can be planned to incorporate the two strategies described. The advantage of a planned program is that literature is taught rather than presented only peripherally. Such a program becomes the center of a wide reading effort that stimulates children's thinking and their responses to literature; it also makes use of such sound practices as:

1. *Sustained silent reading*: Everybody in the whole school reads.
2. *Reader's theater*: Children read the roles in a story after adapting it for this purpose.
3. *The reading center*: Here children listen to stories on tape or read books and magazines, as well as writing their own stories.

SUMMARY

As education "shifts into the future tense," in the words of Alvin Toffler,⁵ the language arts curriculum should reflect the best of what we know about teaching. The process we have described here—designing a curriculum based on selected goals and appropriate teaching strategies—will enable us to create a strong, but flexible language arts program that will prepare students to live in the 1980's. This process will also enable us to continue adapting and adjusting the language arts program to fit the changing needs of the future.

REFERENCES

1. Mead, Margaret. "That Each Child May Learn What It Is To Be Completely Human." Address given at the sixty-second annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Minneapolis, November 23, 1972.
2. Tiedt, Iris M. *Exploring Books with Children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.
3. *Ibid.*
4. "Reading Ideas; A Monthly Newsletter." (Box 1524, San Jose, California 95109).
5. Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House, 1970. p. 363.

Additional Readings

- Anastasiow, Nicholas. *Oral Language: Expression of Thought*. Second edition. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1979.
- Elementary Teachers' Ideas and Materials Workshop*. Published by Parker Publishing Company, West Nyack, N.Y. 10994.
- Language Arts*. Published by The National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801.
- Moffett, James, and Wagner, Betty Jane. *Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13*. Second edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- Page, William D., and Pinell, Gay Su. *Teaching Reading Comprehension*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English and ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1979.
- Smith, Frank. *Psycholinguistics and Reading*. New York: Holt, 1973.
- Tiedt, Iris M., and Tiedt, Sidney W. *Contemporary English in the Elementary School*. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Weaver, Constance. *Grammar for Teachers: Perspectives and Definitions*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979.

CHAPTER 9

English in the Middle School

Jeffrey N. Golub

The middle school has become a most paradoxical institution: On the one hand, it reflects the educational community's acknowledgment that there is, indeed, something unique about the instructional needs and the developmental level of early adolescent students. Yet, the nature of both the curriculum and the instructional approach in the middle school has been influenced mainly by the demands of the back-to-the-basics movement, a force that—with its emphasis on accountability and student learning objectives—has kept English instruction from being truly responsive to the uniqueness of the students involved. The greatest disappointment of the basics movement, in fact, is the loss of perspective that has resulted. We seem to have lost perspective of what is worth knowing, of how students learn, and of what should be the role or function of the teacher in the classroom. I don't know if the number of middle schools will continue to increase during the 80's; but if this educational concept is to survive at all, an instructional approach that is both unique and appropriate must be developed for the middle school. In this chapter, then, I want to identify what I see as some of the elements of this lost perspective and describe some options for instruction that might emerge as a result of regaining our perspective.

THE INTERPERSONAL ELEMENT IN EDUCATION

One of the significant distinguishing characteristics of the early adolescent child is his or her search for identity. The child's self-image is emerging as "self"-consciousness at this time and is particularly susceptible to change and influence. The perspective that seems to be ignored, however, is the way in which the child's self-image develops. A *transactional* perspective of this process asserts that our self-image develops in response to how we see *others* seeing us. An appropriate analogy occurs as a result of the fact that it is literally impossible for us to see our own face; instead, we must look *outward* at something else—in this case, a mirror—and note the reflection that that outward object affords us. In the same way, persons look to others to gain some sense of their own value and worth. In his discussion of this process of transaction, John Stewart states, "Every time persons communicate, they are continually offering definitions of themselves and responding to definitions of the other(s) which they perceive."¹ The appropriateness of our behavior and our acts of communication, for instance, can be evaluated only by gauging their effect on our intended audience. From this perspective, our self-image becomes an *interpersonal* phenomenon, continually subject to modification and further development in response to our perception of the quality of our communication encounters. John Stewart and Gary D'Angelo summarize the importance of this process: "The quality of our interpersonal relationships determines who we are becoming as persons."²

Given middle school students who are struggling with this process—defining themselves through their interactions with others—we can shift our curriculum focus and restructure our instructional approach to facilitate their personal growth. By working to help students gain increased control of their communication behavior, we can enable them to control the ways in which they present themselves (their "self") to others. Our goal in English instruction in the middle schools, then, should become the development of students' *communication competence*.

THE NATURE OF COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

The Speech Communication Association recently completed an extensive research project involving the use of questionnaires and surveys to assess the nature of functional communication competencies. As a result of the data collected, the following five functions of communication were identified and categorized:

1. *Controlling.* These are communication acts in which the participants' dominant function is to control behavior: for example, commanding, offering, suggesting, permitting, threatening, warning, ...

2. *Feeling.* These are communication acts which express and respond to feelings and attitudes, such as exclaiming, expressing a state or an attitude, taunting, commiserating, tale-telling, blaming, disagreeing, ...

3. *Informing.* These are communication acts in which the participants' function is to offer or seek information: for example, stating information, questioning, answering, justifying, naming, pointing out an object, demonstrating, ...

4. *Ritualizing.* These are communication acts which serve primarily to maintain social relationships and to facilitate social interaction, such as greeting, taking leave, participating in verbal games (pat-a-cake), reciting, ...

5. *Imagining.* These are communication acts which cast the participants in imaginary situations and include creative behaviors such as role playing, fantasizing, speculating, dramatizing, theorizing, and storytelling.³

Communication competence "refers to a person's knowledge of how to use language appropriately in all kinds of communication situations,"⁴ and the SCA researchers identified four communication competencies basic to each of the above five functions:

When people work to develop communication competence, they are concerned with "putting language to work" for them in the following ways: (1) enlarging their *repertoire* of communication acts; (2) *selecting* criteria for making choices from the repertoire; (3) *implementing* the communication acts chosen; and (4) *evaluating* the effectiveness of communication employed.⁵

The major assumption of the SCA research project is that—

. . . the *function of communication* is of paramount importance. . . . Whether students are seventh graders or seniors in high school, they perform all five communication functions. The difference in age is not in the presence or absence of these functional abilities, but in the levels of sophistication with which they employ communication acts. In terms of the four levels of competence, more experienced students (1) give more examples, give more ways of handling the communication in the activity (*repertoire*); (2) use a greater number of criteria and more appropriate criteria in selecting communication acts (*selecting*); (3) employ communication acts

effectively in more varied contexts (implementing); and (4) make sounder judgments about the effectiveness of their communication acts (evaluation).⁶

IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

The SCA report, with its exploration of the nature of oral communication competence, is just beginning to exert an influence on secondary school curriculums. I expect it to have a *major* impact on the teaching of English in the 80's, particularly in middle schools, changing both the focus of the curriculum and the methods of instruction. Some of these expected changes include:

1. *An increased emphasis on informal student talk as a vehicle of learning.*

Students must be given the opportunity to practice a variety of oral communication behaviors if they are to enlarge their repertoires. Work in small groups, role-playing activities, and response-centered class discussions can all contribute to the development of this facet of communication competence. The use of "fishbowl" discussions, in which an outer circle of students observes the behavior of an inner circle of discussants, can provide the feedback necessary for the evaluation and subsequent improvement of students' oral interaction. Too often, students' informal classroom talk is regarded as a nuisance, interfering with the "real" content of English instruction. The SCA report complements the transactional perspective of the communication process, however, because it indicates that students' talk is a phenomenon for study in its own right and that instructional methods should be designed with this insight in mind.

2. *The simultaneous development of both oral and written communication competence.*

There is a remarkable similarity between the range of oral communication functions identified by the SCA report and the continuum of functional writing established by James Britton. Britton's continuum ranged from "poetic" or "reflexive" writing (writing close to the self) to "transactional" or "extensive" writing (writing directed outward to communicate information to another).⁷ In the same way, the oral communication functions range from the "reflexive" (feeling, imagining) to the "extensive" (informing, controlling). The implication of this similarity of functions appears to be a call for instructional strategies designed to develop students' communication competence in *both* the

oral and the written modes. An assignment aimed at improving the students' ability to give directions clearly (informing, transactional function), for example, could be presented with two variations, one for each mode. Classroom instructional methods should have students "flowing" from talking to writing and back again to talking. Students might engage in an oral pre-writing activity (sharing responses to a film; working through a creative drama exercise), "flow" into an appropriate follow-up writing exercise, and then gather in small groups to share what they have written. We should see more of this "flowing" from talking to writing in the 80's because, according to the transactional perspective of communication, both the oral and the written modes involve persons in *perception-sharing*, and it is *this* skill that should become the focus of English instruction.

3. *An instructional approach that emphasizes experiential learning of communication processes.*

As a process-oriented perspective of the language arts continues to gain acceptance in the 80's, we can expect to see increasing use of experiential methods of instruction. Such an approach has students working through a variety of communication experiences with the teacher cast in the role of *facilitator*, one who is available to respond to the students' insights that emerge from their interaction with the experiences.

The change in the teacher's function—from that of a disseminator of information to that of a facilitator in experiential learning situations—is especially important. A basic principle of perception states that persons do not simply respond to their environment; rather, they select from it and interpret it, and their behavior, in turn, is influenced by their interpretations and selective perceptions. Given this phenomenon, not just students in the middle schools but rather those at all educational levels need to explore their perceptions through language and to share their perceptions with others. The teacher as facilitator can provide a learning environment conducive to such exploration and sharing.

CONCLUSION

While communication competence is a desired goal at all levels of education, it represents an especially appropriate direction for English instruction at the middle school level in the 80's. The intimate relationship between one's self-image and one's communication behavior must

be acknowledged and dealt with in the classroom, and teachers' recognition of this concern would provide the middle schools with an educationally sound perspective and purpose, both of which are sorely needed at this time.

REFERENCES

1. Stewart, John. *Bridges Not Walls: A Book About Interpersonal Communication*. Second edition. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977. p. 19.
2. ———, and D'Angelo, Gary. *Together: Communicating Interpersonally*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975. p. 23.
3. Wood, Barbara Sundene, editor. *Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Grades 7-12*. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1977. pp. 4-5.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
7. Britton, James. "Writing to Learn and Learning to Write." *The Humanity of English*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

CHAPTER 10

The Training of English Teachers in the 80's

R. Baird Shuman

A predictive essay gives one the opportunity to dream; to build castles in the air; to construct new, more nearly perfect worlds than the one in which we all presently live. Indeed, the very fact that the contributors to this book are combining dreams with responsible prediction may, in some small way, move their dreams a step or two closer to becoming realities in the new decade. Nevertheless, all of us in writing our chapters have had to take into account as realistically and honestly as possible all of those factors in the decade of the 80's that would encourage change and, equally, all of those factors that would inhibit any departure from the status quo. In this chapter I will attempt to view the social and economic pressures that will in various ways determine the course of teacher education in English during the 80's and beyond; I will also attempt to present some of the ideals toward which the profession might be striving as it considers how best to train teachers for the twenty-first century.

SOME CONTROLLING FACTORS

Perhaps the greatest adjustment all Americans have to make during the 80's is that of realizing that their nation's long undisputed position

as the world's leading economic power is in serious jeopardy. The symptoms of this jeopardy—seemingly uncontrollable inflation, a continuation of a negative balance of payments to foreign countries, an increased energy problem—have already made themselves felt very directly in the area of school finance, which affects everything that goes on in schools. There exists every indication that the situation will become worse before it becomes better. It is not inconceivable that the 1980's could in many fundamental economic respects very much resemble the 1930's. A severe recession before the end of the decade, and most probably within its first five years, is a virtual certainty; an economic depression that might begin here and spread to the rest of the world is certainly not an impossibility.

Superimposed upon this somewhat discouraging economic scenario is a social scenario that will also necessarily affect the ways in which teachers will need to be trained in the years immediately ahead. Among the elements of this scenario, one must consider the following: (1) the third largest industry in our nation today is the illicit drug industry, trailing after the energy and automotive industries; (2) the second highest cause of deaths among today's youngsters of school age is suicide, a course of action chosen by youngsters as young as 8; (3) our nation is rapidly becoming multilingual, and in particular the number of Spanish-speaking people is growing so fast that in many urban areas of the North and Midwest, Spanish is the only language that populations of entire schools can deal with; in the states that border Mexico—California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas—the same situation exists even in the smaller towns; (4) increasing pressures are being exerted on school districts to implement racial and ethnic integration which means, on the one hand, that teachers will be dealing more frequently with students who use dialects or languages different from their own and, on the other hand, that the number of private schools will rise meteorically as parents resist attempts at integration;¹ (5) severely handicapped students will be mainstreamed into regular classrooms; (6) teachers throughout the country will increasingly (and predictably more militantly than ever in the past) work through labor unions and through professional organizations to assure their rights as professionals; and (7) much educational decision making will increasingly fall into the hands of local education councils, including in their membership numbers of students and local citizens sufficient to outnumber any teachers and school administrators who might be included in the membership.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

The much heralded decline in the birth rate in the 60's and early 70's has resulted in marked declines in school enrollments, and it is anticipated that these declines will continue at the secondary level well into the 80's, although modest gains in elementary school enrollments are expected by the mid-80's. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reports, "Since 1973 the annual production of new teachers has dropped an estimated 42 per cent."² Nevertheless, the present supply of teachers of English and many other subjects far exceeds the demand. If this situation persists—and it must be remembered that several factors other than the birth rate could affect it—further declines in teacher education enrollments will be experienced, probably with the following results: (1) many private colleges and universities, feeling severe budgetary pressures, will discontinue undergraduate teacher training programs which have been sustained at great expense for a decreasing number of clients; (2) major colleges of education in the largest and most prestigious public universities will minimize or totally discontinue teacher training programs and concentrate primarily on educational research and on offering graduate-level courses to those who are already certified; (3) more states will take the step that California took more than two decades ago, requiring a fifth year of higher education for those seeking certification—a move that presumably would bring back into being many of the MAT programs that were abandoned during the late 70's.³

Two major factors could mitigate the oversupply of teachers in English. First, the average age of secondary school teachers is now over 40, which indicates that larger numbers of teachers will be retiring in the 80's than at any time in the past. It would be naive to predict that retirees will be replaced on a one-for-one basis; however, retirements will account for large numbers of new positions.

The second factor has to do with class size and work load. The National Council of Teachers of English recommends that secondary school English teachers teach no more than 100 students a day. Presently, the typical teacher load is between 140 and 150, depending on where one finds his or her statistics. The 60-hour week, which has long since been replaced in industry by one of 40 hours (and, in some cases, by one of 36 or 38 hours), is still a reality for conscientious English teachers. Ultimately their professional organizations and their unions will alter this situation, and when this inevitable action occurs, there will be a substantial teacher shortage, particularly of English teachers because the subject involves a paper load so enormous as to require a

compensatory reduction in class size. However, when such a change comes, states that are hard pressed economically may take drastic action, such as dropping the school-leaving age to 15 or even to 14 in order to control expenditures.

THE CLIENTELE OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Just 6.2 percent of the students who will be graduated from college in 1982 presently plans to prepare for teaching careers.⁴ But as undergraduate enrollments dwindle, it becomes increasingly evident that rapidly changing technologies, the dizzying proliferation of new information in areas of learning concerned with communication, and the drastic changes in the populations of the schools in which today's teachers work are making the re-education of those presently engaged in teaching a pressing, even urgent, need. In the 80's, I would predict that many states will come to demand a fifth year of training for those seeking initial certification and that increasing pressures will be put upon those already in service to complete additional college- or university-level work. The oversupply of teachers can be dealt with practically in this way, and the long-term professional outcomes should be desirable.

Given the large numbers of practicing teachers who presently need retraining, those institutions that continue their teacher training programs and that offer work at the graduate level should find a substantial constituency to serve. In the 80's, we will probably see many colleges and universities (1) setting up programs that will bring teachers to the campus for a full year of combined teaching and graduate training;⁵ (2) offering more short, intensive courses, some of them lasting for two or three consecutive weekends, for example, through which teachers can upgrade their skills; (3) scheduling more late afternoon and evening courses during the regular school year so that teachers will be free to attend them; and (4) giving increased attention to sending professors out into the field to work directly with school districts and the teachers in them—this would be brought about not so much by offering the conventional after-school workshops, but by establishing a close affiliation with an individual school for a substantial length of time, perhaps even to the extent that the professor would teach elementary or secondary school classes on a regular basis over an extended period of time. I feel that one day every professor of education in a teacher training institution will be required to return to an elementary or secondary school setting for a given period (probably four or five months) every 5 to 10 years and to become actively involved in the activities of that school.

Such a program would have a profound and immediate effect upon the practicality of teacher training curriculums.

THE CONTENT OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH

The content of teacher training programs in English should reflect English as it is defined by the schools. The narrow definition of English as a subject presented in 1965 by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board has proved to be wholly inadequate, suggesting as it does that, "the scope of the English program be defined as the study of language, literature, and composition, written and oral, and that matters not clearly related to such study be excluded from it."⁶ Huge areas that are legitimately part of any modern English curriculum—listening, media literacy, journalism, drama, and improvisation, for example—were excluded from the Commission's definition.

Teacher training programs that resist change will not attract students and will eventually collapse. Students will not be attracted to programs that fail to make them competitive in the job market, and traditional training programs will not equip their graduates to compete successfully with others who have been trained in special ways or in special areas.

It is fundamental that English teachers must have strong backgrounds in their major, but this should not be interpreted to mean that a strong literary background is, in and of itself, enough. Every person presenting himself or herself for certification in English in the years ahead should have taken organized course work in at least the following areas: a major English or American author; a genre; literature relating to a particular theme; English literature before 1800; English literature after 1800; American literature before 1900; American literature after 1900; a foreign literature, modern or classical; literary criticism; history of the English language; modern descriptive grammar; oral interpretation; freshman composition; advanced expository writing; and creative writing. A comprehensive background in the teaching of reading, some of it with a psycholinguistic emphasis, is also a vital need for teachers of English. This gamut, of course, clearly points to a five-year teacher training program in English.

Over and above these specific course requirements in English and related fields, I believe that teachers in the 80's will substantially increase their employment possibilities by equipping themselves in one or more of the following ways:

1. Become sufficiently fluent in a foreign language to be able to use it as a medium of instruction. American public schools enroll many students who do not speak English, and schools are under legal mandate to provide instruction for them in their native tongues. The most commonly encountered foreign languages in today's schools are Spanish, Greek, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Italian. "The category of the less commonly taught languages (i.e., all languages other than English, French, German, Italian, Latin, and Spanish) accounts for only 1% of the nation's secondary school enrollments and 10.2% of the postsecondary enrollments. Yet these languages are spoken by over 80% of the world's population."⁷ It should also be noted "that of 22,737 secondary schools in the United States, 4,344 do not offer [instruction in] a foreign language at all."⁸ An English teacher who can double in a foreign language is more likely to find a teaching job than one who cannot.
2. Take course work in special education in order to learn something about working with the physically and/or mentally handicapped. Learn braille or the manual language of the deaf.
3. Learn enough about the operation and programming of computers to be able to offer leadership in the establishment of programs of computer-assisted instruction.
4. Know how to coach something, be it football, drama, or tennis. Learn enough about journalism to be able to work knowledgeably with the school newspaper or yearbook.
5. Have a sufficient concentration in a second field to be able to teach in that field.

THE PRACTICAL COMPONENT

Teachers in the 80's will be expected to complete extensive pre-student-teaching practicums, usually equaling at least 100 clock hours, which will be arranged and closely monitored by a teacher training institution. Because this early exposure has already been mandated by many states, more and more students will have had extensive contact with youngsters of the age group that they are preparing to teach before they begin student-teaching internships. They will also have done extensive microteaching that has been videotaped for them to use in analyzing how they teach.

The trend in the 80's will be for longer student-teaching intern-

ships, most probably ranging in length from a full semester to a school year. Teacher trainees will also be encouraged to live for a period of time in a cultural situation drastically different from the one in which they have been raised. Northern Colorado University at Greeley has long had a program that enables students to live in urban ghettos, on Indian reservations, in small farming communities, and the like as part of their training program. Such programs will proliferate. Some teaching internships will rotate—two months in a typical suburban school, two months in an inner city school, two months in an education program based in a prison or a nursing home or a children's hospital, two months in a reservation school or in a barrio or in some other unique setting.

WHO WILL TRAIN TEACHERS?

Teacher training will probably remain the responsibility of colleges and universities unless these institutions prove to be so resistant to change that school people must persuade state legislatures to turn the professional component of teacher training (along with the dollars to finance it) over to them. This could happen if academicians fail to take an active interest in teacher training and if they fail to take a realistic view of what sort of training one needs in order to become an effective teacher. The lines of communication that opened between academicians and educationists through their joint planning of and participation in the NDEA Institutes of the 60's have, in most cases, fallen into disuse. They must be reopened if our institutions of higher learning are to continue to be the major agencies for teacher training in the United States.

REFERENCES

1. In Illinois, for example, nonpublic schools hired 1,800 new teachers in 1976-77, representing 20.6 percent of the teacher demand for the entire state. The number of nonpublic school personnel increased from 17,860 to 19,864 between 1975-76 and 1976-77. *Illinois Teacher Supply and Demand, 1976-77*. Springfield: Illinois Office of Education, 1977. p. 77.
2. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 18: 7; February 26, 1979.
3. James B. Conant strongly urged the establishment of fifth-year programs in *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), as did Alfred Grommon, editor of *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).
4. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 18: 7; February 26, 1979.
5. An example of this is the University Associates Program in Rhetoric, which the author directs, at the University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign. This program brings to the campus 8-10 experienced secondary school teachers who hold at least master's degrees

in English or English Education and who are on sabbatical leaves from their school districts. The University pays them half their regular salary in return for which they teach three sections of Freshman Rhetoric each semester. They also take courses at the University, and most of them, when they return to their home districts, are engaged in staff development work as well as in classroom teaching.

6. *Freedom and Discipline in English*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965. p. 13.

7. "Report of the MLA Task Force on the Less Commonly Taught Languages." *ADFL Bulletin* 10 (i): 7; 1978.

8. "Report of the MLA Task Force on the Commonly Taught Languages." *ADFL Bulletin* 10 (i): 2; 1978.

CHAPTER 11

The Media and the English Curriculum

Betty P. Cleaver

English teachers have generally found the teaching of literature to be a valid concern. But over the years the English curriculum has been stretched to accommodate not only literature but also all the contents its practitioners and critics have deemed appropriate. At various times the English curriculum has included business letters, history of the English language, Shakespearean plays, Black English, American literature, transformational/generative grammar, haiku poetry, and film making. English teachers have questioned the appropriateness of some of these topics, much as they have disagreed sharply on whether to include the study or use of media in the classroom.

When the word *media* is dignified with a definite article, as in the title of this chapter, it is commonly understood to refer to broadcast or publicly disseminated music, words, pictures, and/or speech. In the context of the classroom, *media* usually refers to the broad range of audiovisual instructional materials and the equipment necessary for their use. Actually, instruction in American classrooms has included the use of media since the hornbook was first used to teach children the alphabet, but books and other printed materials are seldom considered in the same light as audio and visual materials, and they are never referred to as *aids*.

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

Speak, Look, and Listen, published in 1944, was one of a series of pamphlets on communication put out by the National Council of Teachers of English; it stated that, "Audio-visual aids can help enrich the child's understanding because they broaden the possibilities of experience upon which thorough understanding is based."¹ The Council further suggested the establishment of an English laboratory that would include provision for typing, reading, studying a globe, viewing a motion picture, or staging a play. At the same time, its use of language could be interpreted to mean that audiovisual materials were not central to the curriculum: they were "aids." When motion pictures and filmstrips were first introduced into the classroom, they had to be considered as aids, as enriching materials, because they were so few in number. Teachers did not have the opportunity to preview and select from a wide range of materials as they do today. Unfortunately, we still use the term *aids* to describe the rich resources at our command, and the implication that audiovisual materials are supplementary is still present.

During the 1980's, teachers will be trained in classes at their educational institutions and in workshops and conferences of their professional associations to select the audiovisual and/or print materials most appropriate for particular learning goals. The following sample goals illustrate the usefulness of such materials in the classroom:

1. *To help students understand that the same passages in a play can be presented so differently that an audience will have different perceptions of and reactions to it, depending on the actor or actress who portrays a role.* This might mean that the class would read *Hamlet* and then view several film interpretations of the play, perhaps contrasting Nicol Williams' *Hamlet* with Laurence Olivier's earlier production.
2. *To emphasize the richness and variety of spoken language.* Students would be asked to use an audiotape recorder to record tales and experiences related by an older member of the family. The same tale would be written out in formal language and also listened to as it was recorded. This could lead to a study of dialect and a history of the changes in language.

These activities should be routine. They are not innovative; in fact, they are yesterday's methods. It is disquieting that they could be seen as new, but to many practicing teachers, they are. After a study of English instruction at Illinois community colleges, Rose Marie Lynch reported:

I discovered a dismaying lack of knowledge about educational innovations. Many composition instructors seemed totally unaware of methods and materials that long ago passed the experimental stage. . . . The significant revelation in this study was not that so few instructors said they were involved in innovative work, but that so many instructors were so badly informed. Most of the approaches that were identified as innovative were standard, traditional approaches.²

The change in the use of audiovisual materials will be one of integration. Materials will be chosen because they can advance a particular goal; they will fit neatly into the whole teaching and learning environment. A teacher will go to the library/media center with a teaching problem and will select print or audiovisual materials to solve it. Teachers will have a greater knowledge of learning resources, and will be less likely to start their search for materials by asking for a particular *form* (e.g., "I want to use a movie next week," or, "I want to find a filmstrip").³ The search for materials will be facilitated by a computer terminal in the school or a district media center. The White House Conference on Library and Information Science (November 1979) has strongly recommended that schools join together in a network to list and share their learning resources. Subject searches by computer are still unsatisfactory, but in another 10 years it will be possible for the English teacher to get computerized printouts, perhaps by requesting a list of materials appropriate for a study of Civil War literature. One could make the request more specific, stating that materials should be visual, produced in the last five years, appropriate for grades 7 and 8, and focused on the social conditions that led to conflict. The terminal would then print out a list of instructional materials, giving the title and location of each. The technology for this already exists; we have not had the interest or the will to demand that technology serve the schools as it serves business.

Media can be used in the classroom to provide vicarious experience, to stimulate ideas, to extend the students' world. They will also be used to provide students with alternatives in content and teaching style. Some of the media will be placed in a carrel where students can view and listen individually or in groups. Some of these audiovisual materials will be correlated and arranged to form self-instructional modules, providing opportunities for advanced study for the gifted student and for remediation for others. Students come to school from diverse backgrounds, with varying interests, skills, and knowledge. This diversity can enrich the English class as students explore the language and litera-

ture of the curriculum and share their unique language and literary heritages with each other. This same diversity calls for the teacher to individualize instruction, to use alternative approaches to a single goal. During the 80's we will begin to use learning resources in more humane and sensitive ways.

Thus, while the forms of audiovisual instructional materials may change, the greatest changes will take place in the way they are selected and used. They will be integrated into the whole pattern of teaching and learning in an effort to provide alternative paths to common goals. The dichotomy of print and audiovisual will tend to disappear as the search for materials for teaching and learning emphasizes substance, not form.

THE ELECTRONIC MEDIA

The electronic media could have been included in the discussion of audiovisual instructional materials since they carry visual and auditory messages, but they might have overshadowed the simpler forms. When we talk about television, it seems to assume a life of its own for its detractors as well as its admirers.

Electronic and laser technology makes possible the transmission of moving images via satellites in outer space as well as the projection of three-dimensional images which we can walk around. Our capacity for invention has outdistanced our ability for translation. It seems highly speculative to predict that a three-dimensional image of the Globe Theater could be projected into the classroom air—but this is well within the realm of possibility *now*. It seems unlikely that such an image could be received by dialing a number on the telephone, or that teachers could retrieve images from a visual bank as they now retrieve books from a library—but these are also possibilities.

It is tempting to focus on the inventions that will be available to teachers in the 80's, but any predictions we might make, even the wildest surmises, can only be pale shadows of the things to come. Technological advances are germane only as they relate to our conceptual development, our ability to understand and explain the relationship of technology to human experience. C.P. Snow deplored the division between humanist and scientist in our culture,⁴ and in a small way this alienation is intensified every time the English teacher consigns the technology of instruction to the science classroom.

The fear that technology will dehumanize education has led to an insular attitude that must change. The moving image—

... is not a repository and storehouse but a powerhouse where energy of one kind of experience is transformed into energy of another kind of experience. The moving image lacks print's supreme ability to induce private contemplation, to generate theories and arguments. It lacks many qualities to be found in other forms of expression. But it gives articulate voice, sight and sense to man's current strivings.⁵

These moving images *can* distort reality and pervert truth, but so can the words on the printed page. The mechanics of deception may differ—nuance is found in a gesture or a flicker of the eyes, and one's vision is controlled by the eye of the camera. In the future, students will routinely view television in the classroom. Videocassettes made on their recorders at home will be brought to class to demonstrate persuasion by the use of words or the angle of a camera. Students will learn to "read" the moving image as they now read a book.

Present-day study of the film usually focuses on the structure and language of film. This is a linear approach; gradually students will consider television, and the moving image, in relation to their total environment. They will be able to understand the power of repetition as they examine subliminal images. They may give testimony to the cumulative effect and affect of commercial television programs, and they may study the way their own perceptions have been formed by their visual world.

Today the moving images of television are usually introduced into the curriculum through use of instructional television programs, which are for the most part designed and produced by the Agency for Instructional Television. These programs usually comprise a series of sequentially arranged lessons about a subject. The teacher receives a description of the program, and a guide which includes background information and suggested follow-up activities. The intent is not to replace the teacher with the program but to enrich and extend the classroom experience. These programs reflect the experience of 10 or more years of instructional television production, and like the old McGuffey Readers, they provide common experiences to students in many areas of the country.

The next challenge for these producers is to incorporate the capabilities of QUBE into instructional television. QUBE is an interactive form of television on a commercial cable network; the viewer can respond to a program by pressing buttons on a control box. In this way viewers in Columbus, Ohio, expressed their agreement/disagreement with President Carter's energy proposals (July 15, 1979). When a re-

sponse capability is added to instructional television, its potential for interaction will be limited only by our imagination.

Videodisc technology will be used to study the moving image in the future. The videodisc, looking not unlike a shiny plastic LP record, can store 54,000 separate images, can index and retrieve those images in a fraction of a second, and can be stopped at any point while the moving image is held at a "still frame." The disc is impervious to scratches and dust, and will be produced and sold much more inexpensively than any videotape or film. Schools will have videodisc recorders, and whole libraries of information and entertainment will be available. Media will play a dual role, both as the content of study and as the tool or transmitter of information.

We have not touched on the potential of miniature cameras, electronic simulators, miniature tape recorders, and microprocessors. Because they are new, they will be interesting to use; the real challenge will be to use them creatively and significantly in the teaching/learning process. But if our future includes only those *things* we now know, we are impoverished. The most important step we can take is to master the technology we have created.

SUMMARY

The English curriculum of the 80's will include the traditional study of language and literature, and will add the study of human beings as they relate to their world. The question of media influence will be probed: We are what we eat; Are we also what we see? Audiovisual media will not take the place of print; the best qualities of both will be called on as educators structure the school experience.

Some prophets say that there will be no schools in the future, that learning will take place in homes and libraries through use of television and computer. This seems highly unlikely to me. I believe we will increase the socialization of the school child by planning for participation in direct and symbolic experiences. The school program will become more highly organized and, at the same time, more flexible. Students will find alternative modes of instruction and will be encouraged to value their differences as they learn to work independently and cooperatively in the pursuit of common goals. Media will provide both the experience and the means of experiencing.

The great challenge to all teachers will be to make use of the marvelous inventions at their command. During the 1980's, we should see media integrated into the total teaching and learning environment, as the dichotomy of print and nonprint disappears.

Attitudes toward media will change; mediated materials will be used in a substantive rather than supplemental fashion. The whole media spectrum will be seen as a means of implementing curriculum goals.

The training of teachers will include some instruction in the selection and utilization of media. As they move into the schools, these new teachers will continue to learn. They will learn *with* their students as, together, they study and experience the symbolism and power of visual and moving images. Finally, we will see a growing appreciation of the ability of media to record for our information and entertainment the whole range of human experience.

REFERENCES

1. Corning, Hobart M. "Introduction." *Speak, Look, and Listen*. (Edited by Harlen M. Adams and George E. Murphy.) Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English, 1944.
2. Lynch, Rose Marie. "Reliving the Past." *College English* 39 (1): 53; September 1977.
3. Any librarian can confirm that this is the way many teachers now start a search for materials.
4. Snow, C.P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
5. Slade, Mark. *Language of Change: Moving Images of Man*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

CHAPTER 12

Media Literacy and the English Curriculum

James Morrow

My adolescence was spent in a cemetery. No, my parents are not tombstone carvers, nor am I a necrophiliac. The graveyard in question, rather antiseptic on recollection but moody enough to my ninth grader's eye, functioned as a backdrop for the half-dozen or so 8mm movies my friends and I produced by way of forgetting that we were going to school. It all started in 1961 with *The Monster-Maker* and proceeded through *The Futurians* (science fiction), *Revenge of the Monster-Maker* (a sequel), *The Ancient Mariner* (literary adaptation), *Callioistro the Sorcerer* (back to basics), and *The Tell-Tale Heart* (basics *cum* literary adaptation).

When it came to exhibiting these efforts in school, we guessed that the English classroom was the one place where they would be accepted as something other than a complete waste of time. We were right; audience reactions ranged from the constructive to the ecstatic. And while nobody offered us any course credits for running a movie company, I'm convinced that my English teachers sensed its educational worth. They understood that coherent movies, even silly coherent movies like ours, happen only through the exercise of language skills. They understood that student moviemakers must invent storylines, write scripts, record dialogue, choose revealing camera viewpoints, edit the shots into something telling, and continually monitor the media environment for new techniques to steal. My face is on completely straight

when I say that behind *Callioistro the Sorcerer* lies an authentic kind of English.

The fusion of discipline and delight that marked my own teen-age filmmaking persuades me that *media literacy*, by which I mean both critical viewing and creative production, deserves to inspire classrooms of the 80's. By demonstrating that the field need not be synonymous with fancy technology, fat budgets, or antiverbal romanticism, media literacy enthusiasts can carve out a respectable niche in the English curriculum. According to my solid-state crystal ball, this reasonably bright future will be secured by three events that happen to recall the cemetery movies of my well-spent youth: a death, a transformation, and a resurrection.

THE DEATH OF TECHNOLOGICAL DETERMINISM

Marshall McLuhan's *Understanding Media*, Edmund Carpenter's *Oh, What a Blow That Phantom Gave Me!* and Tony Schwartz's *The Responsive Chord* are commonly regarded as theoretical bulwarks of media literacy instruction. In the 60's and early 70's their collective thesis—that electronic technologies “shape” the psyche, regardless of individual knowledge or vigilance—enjoyed relatively uncritical acceptance among education reformers, despite its underlying view of the human potential that in retrospect seems extraordinarily downgrade, deterministic, and reactionary. (When McLuhan called something “obsolete,” he meant that it failed to regress us to the Middle Ages, to a time before we were corrupted by godless rationality and literacy.) But now this acceptance is waning, and the 80's will probably bring a shift in our vocabulary. The wind is full of straws.

Straw One. In teachers' magazines like *Media and Methods*, we now see an undeclared moratorium on “global village,” “post-literate,” “electronic information,” and “TV generation.” Even the ever-popular “non-linear” is starting to vanish as educators recognize that television programs are no less structured than books.

Straw Two. Film critic Richard Schickel, who in 1965 enthusiastically introduced *Harper's* readers to McLuhan's ideas, recently concluded that the emperor was naked (“a veritable Watergate of the mind . . . a profound and dangerous conservatism . . . carefully structured to seem ‘groovy’”).

Straw Three. In a *Saturday Review* article in 1967, a ranking McLuhanite informed us that television “really massages those lazy, unused senses”;² 11 years and 180 degrees later this same educator used *Media*

and *Methods* to announce that TV is "dulling and numbing the sensitivities of children."³

Straw Four. The last straw is a pair of popular books that turn the rather rhapsodic technological determinism of the 60's on its head. In Marie Winn's *The Plug-In Drug* and Jerry Mander's *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*, we encounter a viewpoint of television so pessimistic that if it were swallowed, it would put the entire media literacy movement out of business. Mander and the McLuhanites have been colliding like runaway freight trains. The McLuhanites:

Television extends global man throughout the ecological biosphere twenty-four hours a day. . . . This implosive, self-revealing, consciousness-expanding process is irreversible.

Through the art and technology of expanded cinema we shall create heaven right here on earth.⁴

versus Mander:

All technologies should be assumed guilty of dangerous effects until proven innocent. . . .

No influx of talented directors or writers can . . . change how television's technical limits confine awareness.⁵

It is clear that both views would put us on the wrong track. Whatever rhetoric we choose to replace technological determinism, the McLuhan debacle suggests that we should not settle for cant. When we embrace the media experts of the 80's, it must be with the intention of wrestling them to the ground.

Imagination, mental imagery, conceptualization, creativity, wit, and similar ideas not dreamt of in determinist philosophy all strike me as interesting, accurate terms with which to define *media literacy*. Professor James Carey has summarized a simple truth too long ignored by media-in-education enthusiasts:

Media . . . limit and control to some degree the expressive capacities of men. But the history of these forms is the history of attempts to overcome the deficiencies inherent in media of communication, to make media bend to thought and imagination rather than allowing thought and imagination to be imprisoned by them.⁶

Every time we are excited by a media production—a good Hollywood movie, a new Ray Bradbury story, tonight's entry on *Radio Mystery Theater*—we know that somebody with talent and gumption said, "I can envision a finished show, and I think I can make it work." Whether the

result ultimately reaches us on a disc, tape, film, or page, it remains rooted in the private obsessions of an individual. Imagination is the one technology that never becomes obsolete.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF VISUAL LITERACY

Although Gene Youngblood's visionary book *Expanded Cinema* gleefully asserts that new communications technologies herald "the end of fiction," make-believe drama and comedy are likely to dominate mass media in the 80's no less than in previous decades. The Youngblood aesthetic—we mustn't enjoy a movie unless it doesn't tell a story—now seems even more puritanical and suffocating than it did in 1970. The vicarious pleasures of narrative are so intense that tomorrow's audiences will, I suspect, seek them without fear of being thought *arrière-garde*. Of course, particular hardwares and softwares may develop to the detriment of others. For example, the film-over-videotape asymmetry of prime-time television could shift in favor of videotape. But pictorial storytelling, embodied in the shot-cut-shot-cut-shot-cut-shot-cut grammar invented by D.W. Griffith and other pioneering directors, will probably characterize media entertainment for years to come.

By recognizing this historical constant, we can answer the accusation that media literacy must concern only the trendy and the transient. In the recent past, communications prophets regularly confused the unending stream of electronic innovation (xerography, videocassettes) with breakthroughs in form, content, language, and meaning. The forecasts were more predictable than predictive; media study invariably ended up at the center of the universe as assorted cybernetic novelties eclipsed stick-in-the-mud English and operating a portapak became a "survival skill."

[When] media technology becomes more advanced, the ability to read media events critically will become of greater importance than it is now. . . . By the year 2000, multimedia and multisensory learning will receive greater emphasis than print media instruction.⁷

Now, I am as anxious as the next film nut to see nonprint media taken seriously in schools, but I am unwilling to achieve this goal through obfuscation and bluff. First of all, let's admit that single-sense media like novels and radio plays, with their appeal to the mind's eyes and ears, have a range equal to any technicolor-sensurround-holographic-smell-o-vision talkie. In its own modest-miraculous way, *Moby Dick* is as plenary as *Star Wars*. Let's admit that as a visual record of

human speech, writing is not just another technical device like holography or the filmstrip. It is bound to our biological makeup. Electricity does not overthrow the print medium any more than dialysis machines overthrow the kidney. And, finally, let's admit that the oft-made equation between words and images is fraught with imperfections. To put the matter crudely, we use words to discuss *The Deer Hunter*, but we don't use *The Deer Hunter* to discuss words.

As I see it, pictorial language and verbal language occupy domains that are at once different and complementary. They lie at oblique angles to each other, intersecting in surprising, potent ways. Perhaps more than other people, writers grasp this mutually nourishing reciprocity. To quote Harlan Ellison:

I have been more influenced by the visual arts . . . in the creation of my stories than ever I was by the printed word. . . . "Croatoan" was written around a magnificent painting by a young Italian magic realist. . . . "The Discarded" was directly inspired by the ancestrally surrealist paintings of Hieronymous Bosch.⁸

When an Ellisonian enthusiasm for literature's pictorial dimension is poised against the blunt observation that most media are either purely aural (speech, radio drama, recorded music) or coexpressive (television, theater, sound movies), the notion of *visual literacy* starts to seem inadequate. English educators of the 80's will probably favor the more inclusive term *media literacy*. There remains the need to translate this concept into unambiguous, teachable competencies. Efforts along this line do not have a glorious past: when Eastman Kodak Corporation tried getting specific about visual literacy, the result was a monument to what is sometimes called "teaching the unnecessary." ("Distinguish light from dark" was first on a list of 35 rather innocuous goals. The last two were, "Read a sequence of objects arranged to express, so that others may understand it, a personal emotion," and, "Compose an utterance as above"). With palpable reluctance I suggest that secondary students should come out of a 1980's media literacy unit able to—

1. Watch a television program and state whether it is on film, on videotape, or live.
2. Define the differences between a shot and a cut; distinguish between camera movement and cutting; identify the continuity devices used to avoid jump-cuts.
3. Explain the various types of animation: painted cels, stop-motion models, cutouts, video graphics, computer graphics.
4. Write a movie review that goes beyond mere plot synopsis to

evaluate the director's handling of photography, cutting, dialogue, sound, mood, and ideas.

5. Appreciate the tasks confronted in a scripting session for prime-time television: developing the characters, shaping the story, inventing gags, hitting on bright lines, testing the bounds of taste.

My final behavioral objective is a bit cantankerous. In the future, I would hope that both teachers and students will apply *critical viewing* to materials that purport to teach media literacy, sorting the good stuff (like Jeffrey Schrank's *Understanding Mass Media*) from the appalling preponderance of junk. If I had a nickel for every botched explanation of "persistence of vision" currently in print, I could remake *Gone with the Wind*. The following typifies the grotesque prose in a 1975 text on radio: "It is vital for the sports announcer to be impartial, well prepared, aware of the stakes, able to concentrate solely on the game, ask why things happened, and be unflappable." Apparently the requirements for writing a media literacy resource do not include knowing very much about either media or writing.

THE RESURRECTION OF CLASSROOM PRODUCTION

If the 80's, indeed, witness a break with both the technological determinists and the visual-verbal dichotomizers, a resurgence of creative classroom production may follow. In the past, many educators assumed that the active phase of media literacy must begin with machines: the medium is the message. Today we should remind ourselves that a medium per se says nothing. Installing a television studio will not make students audiovisual communicators any more than installing a printing press will make them journalists. The place to begin is the planning stage: ideas, inspirations, scripts.

Scripts turn private vision into public statement. It is a mistake to classify film, TV, or comics as *nonverbal*. The significance of the mass media is not that they are nonverbal, but that they are verbal in a *different way* from term papers. Students who lack dazzling vocabularies and flawless grammar can still successfully script—and then execute—media productions, calling upon the vast familiarity with character, dialogue, and plot that they have acquired from the culture at large.

Because such activity is motivating and fun, I believe it embodies what Professor Yetta Goodman calls "respect for the language learner." Conservative critics who portray media teachers as subverting "basic education" forget that the spirit of 60's reform was not a retreat from

knowledge but a compassionate desire to make knowledge meaningful for students who felt beaten down by print.

Where the reform foundered, I think, was on its assumption that as kids glue themselves to the tube, they absorb subliminally a full working knowledge of media grammars. Too many garbled student films have crossed my eyes for me to feel that untutored self-expression in electrochemical technology counts for much. Thus, while student scripts need not exhibit Mandarin prose, they do require intellectual effort. In writing *Calliostro the Sorcerer*, for example, I was faced with the problem of sealing up a hole in a brick tower. (It contained Calliostro's precious bones.) The solution: have the sorcerer thrust his cape over the hole, zoom in on the cape, stop the camera, move everything to an unbreached face of the tower, start the camera again, and zoom out so that a few black frames of cape disguise the cut.

Such unabashedly cognitive facets of creative production are not universally appreciated. In the mid-70's, filmmaking courses perished in droves as guidance counselors robbed them of vital diversity by advising the academically talented to steer clear. In the 80's, then, teacher training workshops and materials will need to celebrate the rigor of media—audiovisual basics, if you like—as well as the romance. Recording clean sound, shooting crisp pictures, maintaining visual continuity, and employing the laws of representational drawing are all “grammar skills” worth identifying and mastering. Beyond lies a kind of multimedia English characterized by neither hardware nor softheadedness but by learners giving voice to their imaginations.

1. *Radio drama production*: “Movies in your head”—“theater of the mind”—call it what you will. On a microbudget, students can outclass TV imagery and spin phantasmagoric worlds.
2. *Slidetape production*: Only minimal technology is needed for students to fuse words and images in dynamic ways.
3. *Super-8 moviemaking*: Pick up the latest issue of *Super-8 Filmmaker* and see how this format is exploding. I prefer it to video: the technology doesn't do all the work for you.
4. *Comicbook creation*: Once students get past the drawing problem—collaboration is one answer—they can create visual-verbal fiction without the technical incumbrances of TV or super-8 sound.

I shall conclude this chapter by offering another prediction, the only one I make with total confidence. At some point in the 80's we can

expect a commercial TV series about the hippies of the 60's. It will be called *Flower Children* or *Far Out* or possibly *Getting Radicalized*, and we'll see the kids smoking pot and listening to The Doors and making protest signs and having a fine old time. It will be a stupendous hit—on this you can rely.

REFERENCES

1. Quoted in: Morrow, James. "Media Literacy in the 80's." *English Journal*, January 1980.
2. "A Schoolman's Guide to Marshall McLuhan." *Saturday Review*, March 18, 1967.
3. "Forward to Basics." *Media and Methods*, May 1978.
4. Youngblood, Gene. *Expanded Cinema*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1970. pp. 78, 419. As George Bernard Shaw put it, "Everything changes, with the possible exception of avant-garde theatre."
5. Mander, Jerry. *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*. New York: William Morrow, 1978. pp. 352, 355.
6. Carey, James. "Harold Adams Innis and Marshall McLuhan." *McLuhan: Pro and Con*. (Edited by Raymond Rosenthal.) Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1968. pp. 295-296.
7. This quotation from an English coordinator in the West Lafayette (Indiana) Community Schools appeared in the following: Leonard, John. "Progress Is When a Poet Replaces a Visual Aid." *The New York Times*, June 1, 1975.
8. Ellison, Harlan. *The Illustrated Harlan Ellison*. New York: Baronet Publishing Company, 1978. p. 4.

CHAPTER 13

Computer-Assisted English Instruction

Richard S. Powers

As the 1970's came to a close, computers were clearly an inevitability. Both the technological development of and the practical applications for computers have broadened so quickly in the last few years that we are now confronted with computer handiwork almost daily. By some counts, the number of terminals in use in the United States alone increased by almost 20 times in the 15 years before 1980.¹

Likewise, Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) seems a foregone conclusion. Education by way of terminal is already widespread in colleges and high schools, and is being used more frequently in the earlier grades, even gaining footholds in elementary school classrooms. That CAI is such a rapidly growing phenomenon is appropriate not just because the computer is an unprecedented educational resource but also because formal education is obliged to be something of a social preparation. *Whether* we should capitulate and use the computer in education is no longer an issue; what is at stake in the 80's is how we as English teachers can best transform what is still considered a threat by some into a beneficent and humanistic tool.

APPREHENSIONS ABOUT COMPUTERS AND CAI

English teachers, and teachers in general, must first be able to distinguish between fact and myth concerning computers. Many of the fears that still persist in our professional community arise over mistaken apprehensions about what the computer can do. As has been pointed out so often, the computer is definitely *not* an autonomous, potentially uncontrollable intellect. It is merely a reservoir of the anticipations and instructions of some human(s). It is no more a thinking thing than a book is, but, to extend the comparison, each computer lesson has the capability of being many different books, depending on how it is being used.

As such, the teacher need never fear being squeezed out or replaced by the computer. Unable to construe or be aware in the full sense, the computer can't and shouldn't be considered a teacher in itself. It can be a drillmaster, an illustrator, and a challenger. Computers are an extension of the personalities and beliefs of their programmers and operators and, thus, should be thought of as merely the augmentation and extension of the teacher—the teacher's tool.

Another fairly persistent fear on the part of educators is that the computer is somehow dehumanizing and impersonal. To those of us in the humanities, the computer may seem another unfortunate particular in an increasingly mechanical world. In actuality, the humanity of the computer, as is the case with the rest of our technology, lies not in the thing itself but in its use. All the tools that we as teachers use are good or bad insofar as how intelligently they are employed.

Still, the idea persists that because it is mechanical, the computer lends itself more readily to mechanical education. Perhaps the very opposite is more accurate. Intelligently used, a terminal can provide a tailor-made, personalized tutor, instantaneously amusing, correcting, encouraging, and reinforcing, even calling the individual student by name and referring to past events that have transpired between student and computer—in short, paying all the personal attention that harried English teachers wish they had time for. The machine can even provide an interactive forum where each student can partake in an ongoing, recorded debate with teachers, fellow students, programmers, and even the program algorithm itself.²

Lamentably, the teaching of English has always involved assigning more or less mechanical exercises and homework meant to increase the students' familiarity with the fundamentals of language. These paper-work exercises are the natural domain of CAI where the computer can serve as selector, assigner, grader, and interpreter. With the computer

replacing traditional grammar exercises, the student who has problems with fragments, for instance, not only can see individually selected textual and visual explanations, but also can work an indefinite number of specifically selected, appropriate exercises. Simultaneously, the computer can diagnose an agreement problem in another student and tailor different exercises for him or her. And the computer's style, its presentation, remains an extension of the teacher/programmer's personality. Thus, the traditionally rote function of the English teacher is relegated to a machine that won't balk at the drudgery, freeing the teacher to spend time with the more involved and subtle questions of writing.

English teachers' suspicion that they may somehow be unqualified or incapable in setting up a CAI program may be the biggest reason that our profession still voices antagonism toward the computer. Such fears are totally unfounded. Coordinating and implementing a series of computerized lessons requires no more specialized skill than does using a new series of texts and workbooks. In most of the software (the lessons and programs themselves) now available, and certainly any software subsequently devised, all instructional functions—such as initialing, altering, and compiling records—are undertaken and executed in plain English. Any teacher who can read and type can organize and bookkeep assignments with great ease. Neither the student working the lessons nor the teacher doing the instructing need have any abstruse knowledge of "programming." It is the great promise of CAI in the 80's that computers are now being made that are capable of being programmed in ordinary English, thereby increasing the possible roles of teachers and students in the instructional process.

Finally, some have a great fear that, whatever their advantages, computers may overwhelm and even frighten the students who use them. Quite simply, there have been many studies indicating the contrary.³ To these studies I would like to add my own observations. During my four-year association with the PLATO project at the University of Illinois, I have continually seen students from elementary to graduate schools intrigued and amused by their computerized lessons. It seems to me that the very young are particularly able to become rapidly comfortable with the machine.

THE FEASIBILITY OF CAI

Having, with any luck, done something about dismissing some common apprehensions, I would like to say a word about the feasibility of widespread computer education in the 80's. The cost of computer

hardware (the actual machines, the nuts and bolts in themselves) is one of the few things that has decreased in absolute dollars in recent years. The million-dollar networks of two decades ago are entirely replaceable by the \$20 chip. Complete microprocessors are now sold in hobby stores for far less than \$1000.

It is now economically possible for the average school district to employ full-scale CAI. Schools have the option of tying into large, established systems where lessons are already available by the thousands. Alternately, they may find individual microprocessors to be more appropriate for their particular needs. Already shops are springing up all over the country that specialize in just such small systems. More importantly, they also carry large lines of pre-existing educational software. The best of these organizations also have extensive teacher training and installment coordination programs, insuring the fast and smooth introduction of CAI into the ordinary classroom.

Those who have nightmares about supplying every student in a given course with a terminal need not worry; the fact is that effective rotation and coordination of actual computer lessons with off-line work mean that CAI requires only about one terminal for each five or six students. Obviously, the cost of hardware proper is not going to be the main impediment in most cases. The greatest net cost will come as a result of supplying the teacher with all the manifold programs needed to supplement class material. The English teacher in particular will need a host of tailor-made lessons. Once again, I emphasize that our greatest resource for answering this need is our students themselves. I've seen young students write quite sophisticated programs after only a short study of the programming language (ordinary programming languages will make this even more possible). I can think of no better way to teach students certain concepts than to ask them to write a lesson teaching that concept.

THE POTENTIAL OF CAI

What does CAI offer the English teacher in particular? Instantaneous judging, branched evaluations, and graphics are among the qualities of computer lessons that can help turn the dry but necessary English drills into something more individualized and provocative. Well-organized routines can combine diagnostic tests, texts that parallel and augment the teacher's lecture, drills, spot checks, animations, games, and post-tests to firmly reinforce and solidify each concept in the student's mind. More important than being a mechanical aid and an extension to

the teacher, the computer has something to offer the student of English. When he or she is taken out of the normal, passive role of absorber, the student of CAI becomes an active learner, a maker of decisions, an instructor of the machine, someone who is making things happen in a veritable laboratory of English language.⁴

How widely and wisely CAI is employed to help teach English in the 80's remains to be seen. We all must remember to see the computer not as a *replacement* of anything—certainly not of teachers or books—but as an additional tool to help us reach our goal of truly humanistic instruction. The 80's will challenge us to broaden our definitions of *language* and *language instruction*. We will be working in the difficult interface between the language of speech and the language of technology. As we intelligently welcome the inevitability of computers into our domain, we will be doing our students a service by providing them with the broader literacy they will need to survive the computerized society. As we help to humanize the use of the computer, and to integrate what are rapidly becoming disparate elements of our society, we will be doing ourselves an even larger service.

REFERENCES

1. Thompson, Nancy. "Computers: The Super Multi-Media Resource." *English Journal* 67(1): 100; 1978.
 2. Errol M. Magidson, a programmer on the PLATO system, mentions these capabilities and more in the systematic article "One More Time: CAI Is Not Dehumanizing." *Audiovisual Instruction* 22 (viii): 20-21; 1977.
 3. Among studies that demonstrate successful English teaching with students of various ages are the following: (1) Altshuler, H.H., and Charp, Sylvia. "A Decade of Usage of the Computers for Instructional Purposes." *Education Digest* 42 (vi): 41-43; 1977 (the authors claim 10 years of success with 13- and 14-year-olds.). (2) Jabs, Max L., and Rudisill, Vivian A. "Multimedia for Reading and Writing." *Community and Junior College Journal* 47 (viii): 16-18; 1977.
 4. Bell, Fredrick. "Why Is Computer-Related Learning So Successful?" *Educational Technology* 14 (xii): 15-18; 1974. Bell holds that this active role of the student makes computer education qualitatively different from many other educational innovations. He feels that the highly nutritional medium of the computer is the cause of its success as a teaching aid.
- Note:* The entire issue of *Educational Technology* 18 (iv); April 1978, is devoted to a discussion of compute. For a good starting bibliography, see: Bell, Rodney J. "ERIC/RCS Report: An Annotated Bibliography of Readings for the Computer Novice and the English Teacher." *English Journal* 68 (i): 88-92; 1979.

CHAPTER 14

ESL in the 80's

Charles R. Duke

English and its relationship with other languages in this country has been a concern for many people, starting, perhaps, with the attempt of early English-speaking settlers to bring native Americans into the English language community and continuing to the present with the increasing emphasis on bilingual and multicultural programs. But how big a concern is this?

Three recent surveys by the National Center for Educational Statistics have shown that in the United States 10.6 million have Spanish language backgrounds; persons with Italian and German language backgrounds constitute groups of nearly 3 million each; estimates suggest another 2 million people with French language backgrounds and 1.5 million with Polish language backgrounds; and individuals with Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Japanese, or Vietnamese backgrounds as a group total nearly another 2 million. Overall, an estimated 28 million people in the United States (one in eight) have non-English language backgrounds, and 32 states contain 100,000 or more persons with non-English-speaking backgrounds. Surprisingly, most of these people are not foreigners; they are native born. Of this 28 million, over 2.4 million do not speak English at all, with approximately 10 percent of these being of school age. Yet only an estimated 102,000 teachers were involved in teaching English as a second language in public schools in

1976-1977, and only 3 out of 10 had ever taken even one course in teaching ESL.¹

SOME BACKGROUND

Only within the past 25 years has teaching English as a second language become a recognized profession, combining the systematic application of a collected body of information about language with knowledge of learning theory. And only within the last 13 years has any nationwide effort been made to do something about the ESL problem. In 1967 Congress added an amendment to existing educational legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which brought about the enactment of ESEA Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act. This was the first time in 191 years that Congress had addressed the question of language minorities. Behind that neglect lurked the deep-felt belief upon which our educational policy for those with limited or no English-speaking proficiency had been built: English, and English alone, was the national language and, thus, the only language to be used in our school systems.

That belief finally was challenged in 1974 when the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear the case of *Lau vs. Nichols*, which charged denial of equal access to education by reason of language discrimination. In its final ruling, the Court declared: "There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education." The Court's ruling was necessary to stimulate action on the behalf of thousands of school children who were not receiving appropriate attention to their language development. Federal agencies, state boards of education, school systems, teachers, and even students themselves have had to do considerable rethinking as a result of the new emphasis on bilingual education.

Since the field of ESL and the entire bilingual area are undergoing tremendous change at this time, it may be useful to define some of the current terminology:

ESL education—an instructional method designed to develop listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English for non-English speakers.

Bilingualism—the ability to communicate in two languages (one of which, in this case, would be English), ranging from a minimal knowledge of either language to a high level of proficiency in both.

Bilingual-multicultural education—a process by which two, or perhaps more, languages, one of which is English, are used as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongues.

Until recently, ESL has been more common, perhaps, on the university level and in the Armed Forces than in elementary and secondary schools. Early practices concentrated on having students learn the second language as a replacement for the mother tongue or first language. This was the basis of language policy for immigrants coming to the United States. For example, in the early 1900's in Pennsylvania where many German immigrants settled, the law made it mandatory that all instruction in the public schools be given in English. It was assumed that by using the common language, the process of integration of different people into a homogeneous group would be hastened. This belief has commonly been called the "melting pot" theory.

This melting pot theory, however, has been challenged by the growing belief that the second language, in this case English, can be a complement to the native tongue, not a replacement for it. Anthropologists have repeatedly asserted that language is a part of a person's culture and, therefore, something to be prized; this view suggests that instead of the melting pot where differences are lost, a language mosaic can be created where individual differences are preserved to add depth and richness to the whole language community. It is this latter view, along with federal support for it, that has begun to make an impact upon schools, leading to the development of bilingual programs where English as a second language is an integral part.

THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Much has been learned during the 1970's about language acquisition, but much more remains to be discovered. We know, however, that the process of language acquisition begins long before a child enters formal schooling. Cognitively, for example, the child faces three basic tasks in language acquisition. First is the matter of *vocabulary development*. The acquisition of words is slow at first; six months after children have spoken the first "meaningful utterance," they may not have added substantially to their collection of words. Then comes a point where words are added rapidly, seeming to occur when cognitive development has reached the point where children perceive that things, events, and properties have names.

Vocabulary is not the only aspect of language to be acquired; while

the speaker of any language must learn the morphemes, or basic parts of words, as well as the complete words needed to convey meaning in a particular language, the speaker must also learn the phonemes or sounds that differentiate meaning and the syntax or structure of the language. Research suggests that by the age of eight, the child may be able to produce all the sounds used to communicate meaning in English. At the same time, children retain the ability to produce other speech sounds; this is the primary reason why young children can, and often do, acquire a second language more easily than do adults.²

The process of language acquisition begins before a child reaches school age, but because it is an ongoing process, the school can be an important factor, particularly in the early years. Three periods are often identified as being especially significant in this process. One of these is that of early childhood, commonly called the "preschool years"; the acquisition of the sound system of a language is largely achieved during this time. The years spent in elementary school constitute a second stage; during this time, students become aware of and increasingly proficient in the basic patterns of structure in English. The years of adolescence form the third stage where an interest in developing "new" languages surfaces, although this interest is often hampered by factors in the school program that inhibit language exploration.

Along with this knowledge of language acquisition has come a growing realization that cognitive development alone may not be sufficient for second language learning. Many variables can affect both first and second language acquisition: *cultural background*—the parents' education and background, the attitudes toward school, the target culture; *community background*—persons of similar origin tend to group together and the value of language in that grouping becomes important to the acquisition or lack of a second language; and *school curriculum*—experiences with the second language, the caliber of instruction, student and teacher relationships, materials and methods. The list of variables is long, suggesting that simply knowing the cognitive pattern of language acquisition is not adequate; we must also consider many intangibles which will face the learner and affect his or her response to the prospects of learning a second language.³

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

It will be of increasing importance to eradicate the myth that non-English-speaking students are "disadvantaged" in the same sense as

those from low-income environments. Congress has already taken a large step in this direction by outlining the beginnings of a national educational policy that urges that children in their early stages of schooling should learn two languages and be able to perform academically in both. The intent here is not to make the United States a bilingual nation so much as it is to recognize that in some environments where there are significant numbers of non-English-speaking young people, mono-English-speaking classmates should share both languages and cultures in the classroom. Such a situation already exists in Quebec, Canada where French is being taught to English-speaking children and English to French-speaking children. Studies suggest that academic achievement is not hindered by this practice and that social adjustment is improved.⁴ In response to this emerging policy, the principal changes to be seen in the 80's will be reflected in the following areas.

Multicultural Education

Language has emerged as one of the principal factors in multicultural education. Educators have slowly realized that language is a principal aspect of cultural differences. This realization must now be translated into action that will help to minimize the cultural differences while still retaining the individual student's right to his or her own linguistic heritage. In general, the multicultural classroom should be a rich sociolinguistic environment where much talking and listening occur, where the native languages and dialects of all speakers are respected, and where the full range of language styles and functions can be employed.

Accompanying this shift in emphasis will be increased attention to relating language to its cultural contexts. Materials will begin to appear that will enable students to learn concepts from a variety of cultures. Anthropologists will offer continuing help in the cultural contexts, providing us with additional information on the ethnography of speaking; their techniques will help us validate information about the verbal and nonverbal routines, systems, and elements necessary for effective social communication to occur in a multicultural society.

Successful programs in multicultural education will be designed to do the following:

1. Develop understanding and respect for cultural differences;
2. Adapt teaching styles, classroom organization, and management to accommodate the styles of learning and values taught in students' homes;

3. Adapt educational content for maximum relevance to the bilingual-multicultural community;
4. Increase understanding and respect for the values and traditions of each group's cultural heritage;
5. Enhance students' positive feelings of identity as individuals and as members of a family, a group, a community, and a nation.⁵

Bilingual Education

In conjunction with cultural pluralism, bilingualism will grow in importance and make its influence felt on school curriculums. Some forty-two languages other than American Standard English are commonly spoken in this country; present efforts are addressed to only those speaking Spanish, French, Portuguese, Cantonese, and Native American languages because these comprise the greatest part of the non-English-speaking population. Establishment of bilingual programs will mean that instruction in the content areas such as mathematics, science, and history will occur in languages other than English. Because it is important that non-English-speaking students be able to "keep up" with their English-speaking peers, supplementary programs will appear in areas where the numbers of non-English-speaking students are not large enough to warrant a complete bilingual program. These support programs, still in the experimental stages, may include the use of content teachers who are bilingual, tutorials with bilingual aides, media approaches such as telephone tutorials where a student may phone for translation support and clarification, and cassette recordings of instructional content in the student's own language. Where full bilingual programs are developed, the student's progression from learning in the various subject areas in the first language to learning in the second language will be dependent upon second language acquisition. As the student achieves measurable proficiency in the second language, subject matter in the bilingual program will be taught through that language in areas where language ability is a criterion for success. As the student achieves a higher level of second language proficiency, subject matter can be taught through that language in areas where a higher degree of language ability is required for success. As the student achieves mastery of the two languages, any subject matter can be presented in either or both languages.

Teacher Training

Bilingual programs will be only as good as the teachers who staff them. The teaching of English as a second language has been based

traditionally upon the theory of assimilation; for years TESL directed its attention to teaching English to non-English speakers overseas, to foreign students who needed English to study in American higher education, and to immigrants who needed English to find jobs or to obtain citizenship in the United States. Gradually the ESL profession came to realize that many students in the elementary and secondary public schools also were trying to learn English as a second language; the focus, then, shifted to this new population, although retaining the primary goal of assimilation. Now, however, ESL's professional organization, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), is changing many of its standards for training, which represents a shift to bilingualism and an acceptance of multicultural education.⁶

The increasing emphasis on cultural pluralism in this country will begin to have its effect on teacher training, not only for ESL teachers but also for all teachers. Those teachers already in the field will turn increasingly to in-service training and advanced degree programs for teaching methods and content. Among the competencies required of the bilingual teacher will be the following:

1. Demonstrated fluency in English and in the language of the minority community to be served
2. Knowledge of the culture, the history, and the current problems of both the students and the entire community
3. Attitudes that reflect understanding and acceptance of and empathy with students from non-English-speaking environments
4. Demonstrated ability to teach the content subject matter in the language of the minority community
5. Insight into how the process of language acquisition affects both first and second language learning.⁷

A FINAL WORD

The growing legal obligation for school districts to provide bilingual education will have a definite impact upon instruction and curriculums during the 80's. The role of ESL in this shift of emphasis will be a new one. Prior to the statutes calling for increased integration of second language learning, ESL was primarily a "pull-out" program; that is, students were pulled out of regular classes for certain periods of time, given ESL instruction, and then sent back to their regular classes. With the new emphasis on bilingual-multicultural education, ESL will be integrated into the overall programs. This will mean that the ESL

teacher will have to become a content specialist as well as a linguistic specialist.

Much remains to be done before ESL will find a comfortable home within the regular classroom routine. But we now know that surface knowledge of English alone will not equip the non-English-speaking student to learn content material in a classroom of native English speakers. With this knowledge, we can meet the challenge of the 80's by devising new and more appropriate strategies that will enable us to meet the linguistic and cultural needs of the many important ethnic groups that comprise our society.

REFERENCES

1. Waggoner, Dorothy. "Non-English Language Background Persons: Three U.S. Surveys." *TESOL Quarterly* 12: 247-259; 1978.
2. Hakuta, Kenji, and Cancino, Herlinda. "Trends in Second Language Acquisition Research." *Harvard Educational Review* 47: 294-316; 1977.
3. Brown, H. Douglas. "Affective Variables in Second Language Acquisition." *Language Learning, a Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23: 231-245; 1973.
4. Bruch, Margaret, and others. "Bilingual Schooling Through the Elementary Grades: The St. Lambert Project at Grade Seven." *Language Learning, a Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1974. pp. 183-204. Also: Zappert, Lorraine T., and Cruz, B. Roberts. "Bilingual Education: An Appraisal of Empirical Research." Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Unified School District, 1977.
5. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education and English as a Second Language Education: A Framework for Elementary and Secondary Schools." Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1974. Also: Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Foundations for Teaching English as a Second Language: Theory and Method for Multicultural Education*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
6. "Statement of Qualifications and Guidelines for Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages." *TESOL Newsletter* 4: 4-5; 1970.
7. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education and English as a Second Language Education: A Framework for Elementary and Secondary Schools."

CHAPTER 15

English and Vocational Education for the 80's

Charles J. Law, Jr.
Denny T. Wolfe, Jr.

Historically, teachers have not been favorably inclined toward considering any direct curricular relationships between English and vocational education. In 1917 the "Committee of Seventeen," created jointly by the National Council of Teachers of English and the National Education Association, proclaimed that English is a *preparation for life*¹ (which includes work); however, educators have drawn few inferences, and only superficial ones at that, from this statement with regard to links that exist between English as a school subject and vocational education. As late as 1967, Jacob Kaufman and his colleagues concluded from an attitudinal survey of more than 1,600 high school teachers that "academic teachers from comprehensive high schools . . . ranked lowest in support of vocational education."²

When pressed, some teachers and curriculum planners might acknowledge the necessity of one's possessing "communicative competence" for nearly any sort of work, but a persistent assumption has been that English teachers' jobs are to help students develop such competence, anyway; therefore, why tax our minds by trying to determine how to structure (or restructure) a curriculum to reflect concrete relationships between an academic discipline such as English and vocational education, which is generally viewed as something entirely different? We believe that this question deserves an answer—or answers. Most

importantly, we believe that both English teachers and vocational education teachers can benefit pedagogically and substantively from considering each of these subject areas in light of the other. We are also confident that the 1980's will see greater collaboration than ever before between these two areas. Here are some reasons:

1. The 1970's have seen an unprecedented emphasis on "accountability" in education. State laws or policies calling for "minimum competency testing" have been established in nearly all states. The tests purport to measure students' reading and writing abilities, but the tasks that many of the tests require students to perform include filling out application forms, social security cards, bank signature cards, charge account forms, and income tax forms; they require students to write business letters and job résumés and to read and interpret labels, insurance forms, road signs and symbols, classified ads, warranty statements, maps, and charts. Obviously, the clear focus of the tests is on skills and materials related to work.
2. In a survey of Phi Delta Kappans, conducted by Harold Spears in 1973, the basic skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening and the development of pride in work and self ranked *one* and *two* respectively among 18 goals rated by the respondents.³ The results of this survey suggest that educators in the 80's are likely to place a heavier emphasis than ever before on English and vocational education in the total curriculum.
3. The National Council of Teachers of English established in the fall of 1978 a Task Force on Career Education to serve in an advisory capacity for the NCTE Project on Career Education. The ultimate aim of this project is to make recommendations to the NCTE staff regarding the Council's policy on career education. Such a policy could have a far-reaching impact on the ways in which the English curriculum might be modified during the 80's.

WHAT CAN HAPPEN IN THE ENGLISH CLASS?

Experiential learning, the predominant pattern in vocational education, can be used to achieve the goals of English instruction as well. Action-oriented activities and projects in the English class can lead students toward experiencing that sense of euphoria that accompanies a job well done. Of course, the English teacher's responsibility is to help

students grow in their mastery of all the language processes: reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and thinking. But what better way to press students toward higher levels of language maturity than to engage them in the act of *making*? Creating products and participating in interactive learning environments can enable students to develop linguistic competence, literary appreciation, positive self-concept, and job awareness (for example), all at the same time.

Some specific possibilities include the following:

1. Preparing photo essays enables students to practice organizing, viewing, reading, and writing processes, while acquainting them with photography and journalism as potential vocations.
2. Participating in debates helps students to achieve speaking and listening growth as well as to consider the legal profession (for example) as a career.
3. Doing research papers or oral reports (as individuals or groups) on nonconventional subjects, such as the telephone industry, environmental protection, automotive engineering, agribusiness, pharmacology, and the like, can accomplish many of the same goals as doing papers and reports on Dryden, Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and the New Critics, with the added advantage of introducing students to the world of work.
4. Creating class newspapers, recipe books, literary magazines, and local lore anthologies can permit students to use both the school and the community as working laboratories, where they can function as producers and where they can investigate countless vocational careers.
5. Making films, video-tapes, slide-tapes, and radio broadcasts on an infinite variety of subjects can familiarize students with telecommunications as a possible career, as well as enabling them to practice all the language processes in concert.
6. Inventing story dramatizations and other dramatic situations covering any number of subjects can help students cultivate imaginative thinking abilities, while considering advertising, drama, and drama-related fields as possibilities for further study and careers.
7. Developing classroom libraries of brochures, pamphlets, books, and other materials from community resources and having occasional periods of browsing and free reading time can achieve goals common to English instruction and vocational education,

provided the materials cover a broad range of interests and subjects related to jobs and careers.

8. Giving students opportunities to work in groups on preparing mini-units for class presentation (just like teachers' lesson plans)—to include such topics as Business Communications, Values and Work, Computer Technology, Advances in Medicine, and other such subjects—would provide information useful to the whole class, as well as permitting students to practice research and other developmental language skills.
9. Having a class of students from the middle grades through junior high organize a Career Awareness Day for the school or even for themselves would give them early insight into the world of work, as well as involving them in creating posters, writing letters of invitation and thank-you notes, and making many contacts with the community, all of which could result in valuable learning experiences.
10. Using individualized instructional techniques (e.g., learning activity packets, contracting, and independent study) can offer students opportunities to explore vocational interests, as well as stimulating them to practice reading and writing skills while dealing with subjects that have individual appeal.

SUMMARY

These suggested strategies are not new; many teachers are practicing them in schools throughout the country. But those who aware that such learning experiences fall within the philosophical scope and range of goals associated with both vocational and academic education will experience a new sense of security and value about what they are attempting in the English classroom. The prevailing philosophy and goals of vocational education are more similar than dissimilar to those of academic education. And instructional strategies that are action-oriented and experience-based can facilitate students' discovery of answers to the question, "What good is English?"

It is obvious that the instructional strategies we have outlined here attempt to integrate English instruction with only one of the philosophical goals supported by vocational education: to provide individuals with information about the world of work. Although space does not permit us to go further, we invite readers to consider other questions—e.g., What potential relationships exist between a course in drafting—

or printing, or electronics—and the English class? With a common philosophical base upon which to build, English teachers and vocational education teachers can plan together for interdisciplinary education along relatively unexplored lines.

REFERENCES

1. For an overview of the history of English teaching in America, see: Judy, Stephen. *Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1974. pp. 3-19.
2. Kaufman, Joseph, and others. *The Role of the Secondary Schools in the Preparation of Youth for Employment*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Institute for Research on Human Resources, 1967. p. 7.
3. "Kappans Ponder the Goals of Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1973. pp. 29-32.

CHAPTER 16

Dealing with Sexual Stereotypes

Beverly Bates Heneghan

Both college-bound and vocational high school students, as well as academic and technical college students, attend English classes. Because secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities, often lack requirements for courses in logic, rhetoric, literary history, philosophy, or sociology, they have come to depend on English teachers to teach students something about how to write, how to read, how to recognize logical fallacies, how to speak, and how to understand the literature of our language. English teachers, feeling a bit like technicians of the 500-word theme themselves, proceed uphill like Sisyphus, trying to impart humanities to students imbued with the primacy of technology. Along the way up in the 70's these teachers met signs saying "Students' Right to Their Own Language" and "Combat Racism and Sexism." Approaching the top of the peak, they have returned to their starting point, to another sign, "Back to the Basics"—that popular, if variously defined, mandate. Two of these goals on the signposts of the 70's can be reconciled; however, "basics" in the 80's gets back to the basics of English classes: language, logic, and literature—where the stereotypes become obvious.

LANGUAGE

Implicit in any of the words we use is the belief that words influence perception; we define first, then we see. Linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf suggest that "people's perceptions are influenced by their language." As a result of language, people "see and think of their world in a certain way—not the only possible way."¹ Those who share these linguists' opinion are concerned about stereotyping in language because they feel that language affects perceptions, beliefs, and actions; language is prescriptive as well as descriptive.

To explore the hypothesis that language both prescribes and describes, as well as to help students in the 80's develop an awareness of logical fallacies and analyze sex roles in literature, teachers in the future can integrate appropriate exercises into regular classwork. Students can explore the connotations and assumptions of words like *feminine*, *masculine*, *sissy*, *old maid*, *All American*, and *master*; of colloquialisms like *Daddy's little girl*, *Mother's big boy* or *little man*, and *I'm just a housewife*; of sentence structure like the tag question.

Balanced and helpful guidelines and exercises to combat stereotyping are available through NCTE, which reminds its members that teachers "not only help shape students' language patterns but also are viewed by the public as custodians of what is 'correct' in the language."² Another excellent example of classroom exercises is *Role: Your Own*, a handbook prepared by English teachers and published by the Los Angeles City Schools for use throughout their school system.³ The proof, of course, is in the practice. The most effective deterrent to language stereotyping in the classroom is the teacher who is sensitive to it, who recognizes it whenever it occurs in classroom discussion or in classroom reading material, and who explores with the students what the assumptions are and what users of stereotypes communicate to their audiences.

LOGIC

With the inescapable realization of the 70's that far too many students could not write or develop a topic sufficiently to pass a basic proficiency test, the ritual of the 500-word or multiparagraph essay was revived in high schools and re-enforced in colleges. Incremental to the basic steps in teaching the expository essay and preparatory to teaching the research paper is the teaching of basic logic through the evaluation of evidence and the recognition of logical fallacies. Because reasoning

about the sexes is so often fallacious, examples for the unit or discussion on logical fallacies are abundant; students may be asked to identify the fallacy in these often-heard comments: "She's so independent she'll never get married"; "A man always puts his career first, his family second. He has to!"; "Men are better administrators because they are better leaders"; "Women who work neglect their children"; "Either boys play sports or they are sissies"; "Women make the best teachers or nurses"; "Men deserve higher salaries than women do"; "There can be only one boss in the family." Analyzing these fallacies, the students can easily add to the list and become alert to the careless thinking that so often influences important decisions.

LITERATURE

The English classroom of the 80's will have students analyzing literature with perspectives that differ from those of past students; students of the 80's may not have read *A Doll's House*, but they know first-hand what Ibsen is talking about. It is likely that even more women will be returning to colleges than are now there, and high school students will come from homes where mothers most likely will be in the work force. As teachers consider the elements of a literary work—setting, plot, point of view, characterization, theme—each element offers an opportunity to detect stereotyping: In the social setting of the work, "what behavior is considered appropriate for males and females?" Does this standard contrast with today's definition of acceptable behavior? What challenges do the characters face? Are these sex-stereotyped? "What resources do the characters have? Are these representative of human resources, or are they limited by sex-role expectations?" Is the point of view female or male? Does the sex of the narrator shape the theme? If the narrator is male, what are his attitudes, his strengths, his limitations? If female, . . . ? Do the "characters demonstrate intellectual curiosity, independence, interest in a wide range of ideas, ability to think logically? If not, why not?"⁴ How are female characters treated by male characters; male characters by female characters? What expectations do the characters have of themselves? Is either sex omitted from the story? Why? Do all characters seem relevant to the working out of the theme? What makes the characters convincing? How does the theme relate to women and men today? From these questions can come essays that discuss the portrayals of women and men as they are understood by students of the 80's.

PERSPECTIVE ON STEREOTYPING

As teachers meet the challenges of the 80's, they might disagree with sociologist Eli Ginzburg of Columbia University who says the sex role transition is "the most important social change of the twentieth century";⁵ however, they will realize that this role transition emphasizes the importance of students' realizing their own potentials. Teachers should examine their own language and practice; they should avoid the sex-stereotyped assignment. Students should be graded according to an equal standard. Teachers who express high expectations of both women and men convey the message that students need not limit their goals because of their sex.

Procedures on how to deal with sexual stereotypes should allow all teachers to feel comfortable with what they present. The procedures should not imply a view that one sex is villain, the other victim; that women who choose traditional roles are better or worse than other women; that stereotyping is a woman's problem. Stereotyping is a problem that limits everybody. As new "ideals" or "models" of women and men are emerging in literature and life, it is important that these new "ideals" give students freedom of choice regarding what they can be and what they want to be; that they allow students to make traditional choices as well as to build toward new traditions. The recognition and independence of the individual is primary; the gender of students should not be a lens that narrows the focus on the world. The English classroom that helps students to discover the stereotypes that inhibit them introduces these students to the vision of a wider world.

REFERENCES

1. Cited in: Cullen, Constance. "Sexism in Language." *The English Quarterly* 8: 44; Winter 1975.
2. National Council of Teachers of English. "Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language in NCTE Publications." Urbana, Ill.: the Council, 1974. p.7.
3. McHugh, Nancy S.; Wells, Nancy; and Hyndman, Roger. *Role: Your Own*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District, 1976.
4. Questions quoted are excerpted from the checklist provided in *Role: Your Own*. p. 22.
5. Quoted in: Wood, Susan. "My Job, My Self." *Washington Post Magazine*, June 24, 1979. p. 11.

CHAPTER 17

English and Minority Groups

Sandra E. Gibbs

When I began working on this chapter, I decided that I could do it if I changed the title and focused on the teaching of English and its relationship to minority students. I felt that the current title suggested some kind of confrontation, a dichotomy, or surely a tension between the two. I balked at that idea and sought ways to eliminate the strain, real or implicit. The key, I lightly reasoned, lay merely in rephrasing the title and refocusing the point of view. Writing about the teaching of English and its relationship to minority students would resolve my discomfort with the title. It did not.

The more I considered the significance of the topic in relation to the whole issue of teaching English, and the more I considered my own personal feelings about the area, the more I realized that the strain I sensed in the topic was probably that which many Blacks (and, presumably, other minorities) feel whenever we are reminded that our educational concerns are not yet considered in the context of the whole. The teaching of English to minority students and/or the teaching relationships between English teachers and minority students should not be *substantively* different from the teaching of English—period—to whomsoever. What mattered in the 60's, and in the 70's, and what matters in the 80's is that students in English classes acquire the *best*, the maximum in terms of reading and writing skills, and, most importantly, that they

learn how to apply the best critical thinking skills, skills that can be applied to all words—whether spoken or heard, written or read. This is no less true for minority students. What really mattered in the past, what matters in the 80's, and what will matter in coming decades will be the means by which students acquire these skills. The content of English classes and teacher attitudes are what will make the difference.

Having said that, it seems that no more should be necessary. But my realization that others have said it before me; my knowledge that not all minority students are obtaining the best or even, in some cases, adequate reading and writing skills; my awareness that far too many are not learning how best to apply critical thinking skills; my concern that the content of English classes often fails to include the strengths and interests of minorities; and my awareness that teacher attitudes, in too many cases, belie a belief that minority students can learn "English," even in its more pedestrian sense—all of these force me to admit that although it is true that the teaching of English to minority students should not be substantively different from the teaching of English to anyone else, it is not enough simply to say so. As a friend reminded me, in an ideal society where all people were given equal respect for their abilities, where a history of racism against people and their products (be they art or ideas) did not exist, it would not be necessary to consider this matter. Or if minority students were succeeding in large numbers, as they can, in reading and writing, then, again, this chapter might not be necessary.

Minorities do not, to paraphrase Marcia Gillespie, editor of *Essence Magazine*, constitute a "monolithic whole," so it is always dangerous to treat matters concerning them as if they did. My use of the term is, therefore, guarded and restrictive. There are Black Americans, American Indians, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans who are achieving. They read well, they write effectively, and they apply critical thinking skills as needed. These students succeed in English classes as they do in other subjects. For them, learning does not present insurmountable barriers. But what about the Black and Hispanic Americans and American Indians who fall outside the high achiever grouping? What can they expect from their English classes?

A reported gap exists between whites and minorities in one of the highly desired English/language arts skills—reading—and it could increase.¹ And while we take a cautionary view of statistical evidence based on standardized tests, we have to take into account the day-to-day experiential evidence of teachers (and employers) who come into contact with students (minorities and whites) who have difficulty with reading and writing, students who seem to have little interest in master-

ing further language skills, students who see no relationship between the "stuff" that goes on in English classes and their real-life situations. How will English teachers of the 80's deal with such problems? It is no longer enough to lament the situation, to lump minorities into slow learner classes, or to prepare them with only minimum skills, competency tests notwithstanding. The future world is going to need all of our maximum skills.

In the 80's, English teachers and their school systems must more seriously address crucial questions about the learning potential of minority students. For example, why are large numbers of them not performing up to capacity in reading and writing? The notion of cultural deficit popularized in the 60's and 70's obviously will no longer hold.² Nor will allowing test results to be the determining factor in placing or teaching students solve the problem.³

While students' backgrounds must be taken into account, English teachers of the 80's will also need to look at their own backgrounds and teaching strategies. Are they directing their listening, reading, writing, and thinking assignments toward the strengths of white Americans and away from the strengths and interests of Black, Hispanic, and Asian Americans and American Indians? Do English teachers lack information about the cultural learning patterns of minority students? Do they believe that Black and Hispanic American and American Indian students *can learn* to read and write as well as any other students? Are they committed to teaching English in the best possible way to all students? Earl Gray, publisher and editor of *Black Enterprise*, in reflecting on where we will be in year 2000, calls to mind an age-old philosophy when he states that it is instructive "to assess the past in order to get a proper perspective on the present"—so that we can confront the future. This is quite applicable to the plight of minorities in the schools. There was a time, for example, when for Black children there was no such thing as "can't learn to read or write."⁴ There was a time, as Nikki Giovanni reminds us, when "the characteristic persistence of Black teachers" unyieldingly demanded the best—indeed, the *absolute* best—from their students.⁵ This was the time when, as Dr. Mary Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education, observes about her own high school years, "kids [felt] that teachers cared for them . . . and when [they] needed discipline, [the teachers] gave discipline. They did not push [kids] out of school," or lump them into slow learner classes where the incentive was even lower.⁶ Without becoming evangelistic or, I hope, overly moralistic, I think the question of attitudes and commitment to the reading and writing potential of Black American, American Indian, and Hispanic American students will have to be carefully considered by individual English teachers.

We are in a different time. Things have changed (and will continue to do so), so I am not naive enough to suggest that "just caring" is going to enable students to learn to read or write. I, too, realize that "human warmth alone, in and of itself, is not sufficient to raise the achievement levels of black [Americans], American Indians, Hispanic Americans, and other minorities. But, as Geneva Smitherman points out, "a recording of thought" about the learning potential of minority students, a belief that they can learn, is needed.⁷ Believing in them can provide a beginning.

Census bureau figures show that more minority students are staying in school than ever before.⁸ Since we know that Americans constitute a mobile society, these factors would suggest an increase in the odds that English teachers will have minority students in their classes. Thus, the occasional unwillingness to learn more about minorities, their language styles, and their literature, which often expressed itself in the 60's and 70's cliché of "I don't have any Black, American Indian, or Chicano students," will no longer hold in the 80's.⁹

Sonia Sanchez recalls a writing course she once took where she wrote a story about her "father and some of the trials he had gone through." The professor wrote on it, "Things are not that terrible." And he gave her a C+. So she "wrote this story about the mirror beginning to talk to her," and turned it in. "I'm mightily pleased," wrote the professor on her paper. "This is what I'm talking about!" "Of course, that wasn't my reality," notes Ms. Sanchez, "and I dropped the course."¹⁰ Dropping that course (a college one) did not prove disastrous for Sonia Sanchez because she had skills, talent, and interest enough to make what was real to her real to others. Yet many middle school and high school minority students drop out (or tune out) before they acquire the skills.

In the same article, Sonia Sanchez expresses her belief that everything she writes "has been written before; there's that energy there in the universe. Many of us just become attuned to that energy."¹¹ How can minority students learn to tap that ubiquitous energy and produce clearly effective writing? How can their realities and values be accepted as valid enough to operate alongside those of language arts and English teachers? These are questions for which answers must be sought, and until they are found, many Black and Hispanic American and American Indian students will remain indifferent to varied language skills and to the reading world.

The question of "realities" will be far reaching for English teachers of the 80's since two of our mainstays, language and literature, hinge on it. In an insightful and incisive article on the Black younger generation of the 70's, Lerone Bennett, Jr., observed:

More than any other generation, this generation is a child of the media and of everything that that strange and strangely significant word portends. This means, on one level, that the New Generation was raised not on reality but on *images masquerading as reality* [italics mine]. It means, at a deeper level, that constant exposure to flickering images, electronic sounds and disjointed slices of space and time has given rise to a sensibility that is markedly different from the sensibility of the old. This process has deeply affected all Americans, but it has had a marked impact on the minds of Blacks, particularly, young Blacks, who, according to media studies, watch TV at least 10 percent more than white Americans.¹²

Although Bennett's remarks were written in 1978 about an 18-30 age group, much of what he says will be applicable to students in the 1980's. Many will have been nurtured, to a great extent, on television and electronic sounds, and this exposure will affect their reception and perception of what goes on in the classroom. Bill Cook, Associate Professor of English and Director of African and Afro-American students at Dartmouth, has stated to me that "In teaching language and literature, the linking of the classroom world to the quotidian world of the student is vital. How will the English teacher, increasingly isolated from the students' world, bridge this gap?" And further, to paraphrase Mr. Cook, how can English teachers provide language and literature experiences that counteract the realities of many minority students—realities that include the high concentration of minorities in low-paying, semi-skilled and service jobs, the poor housing, and the intro-group exploitation; realities that, as minority students recognize, do not require skill in reading and writing.

John Ogbu's findings in his study of minority education sponsored by the Carnegie Council document the importance of the questions raised above:

The economic reality of most adult blacks' lives is still more discouraging than that of whites and at virtually all income levels. This discouraging reality profoundly shapes black children's skills and attitudes, including their skills and attitudes for learning. Even very young . . . American Indian, Mexican American and Puerto Rican children pick up discouraging but quite realistic messages about the comparatively poor pay off that education is likely to have for them. They live every day surrounded by adults whose education is connected only dimly to their jobs, or [they are surrounded by adults] who cannot find jobs at all.¹³

A segment of the July 1979 special "CBS Reports: Blacks in America: With All Deliberate Speed," identified young people who just

wanted to survive, and it was painfully obvious that their conception of survival did not include mastery of some basic skills. Survival now and in the future, as the report suggested, requires thinking and functional reading and writing skills. It will be a real challenge for English teachers (and other subject teachers) to bring students to accept this.

I asked a selected group of language arts, secondary English, college composition, and literature teachers; English consultants; and supervisors of English programs to identify issues that they see facing English teachers of Black, Hispanic, and Asian American and American Indian students in the 80's, to cite the greatest contributions English teachers can make to these students, and, by commenting on the changes they have observed among minority students of the last two decades, to make predictions about minority students of the 80's. While the sampling in no way purports to be scientifically accurate, I would like to share some of their responses.¹⁴

A major issue cited is one already mentioned here—the attitudes of teachers. There is significant concern that negative attitudes on the part of English teachers about the ability of minority students to learn to read and write will continue to have a crippling effect on the achievement of those students. Coupled with the issue of attitudes is the expressed need for English teachers to gain information about the learning styles of minority students.

A second issue cited involves the teaching of standard English. Most of those who identify this issue stress the need to help students become proficient in reading and writing "mainstream" (or edited American) English. But equal stress was placed on respecting and taking into account *first* the primary language of the students. As one respondent puts it, English teachers must "assess the linguistic strengths the students bring with them, determine what linguistic strategies minority students use well, and use these strengths and strategies" to teach students to use the language most accepted in reading and writing. Equal emphasis is placed on helping students develop a sound understanding of how levels of usage function in society.

I would hope (and if I read the results of the respondents correctly, they share my belief) that we can come to respect the languages minority students bring with them while providing them with skills to select and use all other language options. How English teachers do this without demeaning students' home (or street) language will be a primary task in the 80's. (It was also the task in the 70's, but for Black kids, anyway, it was lost in the debate over whether there was such a thing as Black English or whether it was a separate language or dialect.)

In the 1980's, Black students will be ill served by a continued

debate over Black English. Nor will Hispanic American students who retain vestiges of Spanish in their English usage be helped by efforts to remove all traces of Spanish from their language. Black English is a part of life for most Black students; Spanish is a part of life for many Hispanic Americans. The urgent need in the 80's is to help students transfer their basic understanding of mainstream English (which most hear and understand on television and radio) into a skill that they can use to read and write whatever is required of them, as well as whatever they choose. English teachers must bring students to a point where they can unabashedly use what they learn about language at will.

The challenge for English teachers of the 1980's, identified by several respondents, lies in getting minorities, and other students, excited and interested in what goes on in English classes. The goal must be to bring students to the point where adeptness in varied language usage and the study of literature seem worthwhile pursuits. Whether English teachers meet such a goal will certainly be affected by how well they are able to relate their craft to a world where "the relationship between formal education and adult role allocation" is often unequal,¹⁵ where economic deprivation, energy shortages, and inflationary prices inevitably seem tinged with resurgent racism.

One of the questions I raised on the questionnaire concerned the extent to which minority literature and minority-related materials could be used to help students develop critical thinking skills and employable reading and writing skills. Given a range from "great deal" to "some" to "none," the majority of those responding checked "great deal." Comments from respondents stress that minority literature and minority-related materials should not be limited to minority students and caution that such an approach should not be seen as an isolated panacea. Minority literature must become an integral and consistent part of the *total* English curriculum.

For some minority students, minority literature can provide the touchstone with their own realities that will make reading seem worthwhile. For others it will provide parallels to their own experiences or to experiences of people they know. For many it will describe their dreams and hopes. And for still others it will offer the grist for thinking about alternate ways to deal with life situations. Like all other literature, minority literature uses the literary devices that make literature work. It, too, can serve as a model of language that is effectively used in various ways. And of paramount importance, minority literature makes the same demands on the critical thinking abilities of students as does any other literature.

However, English teachers of the 80's will need to avoid an overuse of one-dimensional Black, Hispanic, and Asian American and American Indian literatures. To focus exclusively on literature that deals excessively with ghettos, barrios, drugs, and inaccurate representations of minority speech is misleading. Black and other minority experiences are varied, and because classroom materials should reflect this fact, English teachers will need to seek out and use literature and materials that are "balanced and realistic; those which reflect diversity of subject matter, style, social and cultural views; and those which accurately portray historical and socioeconomic diversity."¹⁶

Throughout their education in English classes, students need to develop a sense of the large spectrum of minority writers and the broad "range of genres" in which they write.¹⁷ Their understanding of minority literature should lead them to understand that poverty represents only one aspect of the lives of minorities. We, too, have "happy birthdays and very good Christmases." To read only about the "hard childhoods" of minorities is to miss a crucial element of minority experiences—"Black love [and Hispanic and Asian American and American Indian love are] wealth"; love and happiness do operate in the lives of minorities.¹⁸

Although the statistics show more minority students attending college than in the past, the economic uncertainties of the 80's may have adverse effects on college enrollments. Even those who stay in high school beyond the legal age may be affected. And those who stay will, like other students, be vitally concerned with how English classes bear directly on their occupational goals. The possibility exists that a markedly different kind of student rebellion from that of the 60's will occur. Demands may center more on acquiring what students can quickly identify as realistically employable skills rather than on those that they see as purely aesthetic or literary.

As opposed to students of the 60's and 70's, minority students of the 80's will have been involved to a larger extent in the same kinds of experiences as their nonminority peers. (Several respondents point to less student hostility than in the 60's, but also to a growing apathy among some minority students and an unwillingness, on the part of many, to be labeled in a minority group.) Many of them will not take English classes (or other classes) that isolate their experiences. Few may, unfortunately, feel the desire or "sense of duty" to learn about the literary contributions (or to accept the linguistic ones) of minorities. However, rather than abolishing minority subject courses (or departments), such as Afro-American literature, Chicano literature, etc., he-

cause of what seems to be lack of interest or pressure, educators must incorporate minority studies into the total curriculum.¹⁹ The less minorities study their contributions and roles in society and the less nonminorities study the same, the poorer each will be in dealing with each other in a pluralistic world.

Minority students of the 80's and their English teachers will bring to the classroom all their past experiences and expectations. Some students will not seek to achieve above the minimum (possibly a potentially hazardous effect of minimal competency testing); many English teachers who are weighed down by increasing responsibilities, low pay, and disillusionment may be tempted to let the minimum serve as the maximum. To counteract both probabilities, in-service and teacher training programs will need to give more attention to helping English teachers learn how "to use what [minority students] already know to move them to what they need to know."²⁰

REFERENCES

1. *Results of Two National Reading Assessments*. Denver, Colo.: National Assessment of Educational Progress. The report, based on the 1975 reading assessment, showed nine-year-old "black children 13 percentage points below their white counterparts in overall reading levels. For 13 year olds, the performance level of whites is about 17 percentage points higher than the performance level of blacks. And the difference between the average percentage of black and white 17 year olds answering correctly is about 19 percentage points."

Hispanic Student Achievement of Five Learning Areas: 1971-75. Report No. BR-2. Denver, Colo.: National Assessment of Educational Progress, May 1977. This research shows that Hispanic and Black students at age nine perform at about the same level in reading, at least 10 percentage points below white students. At age 13, Blacks were 13 percentage points below the achievement level and Hispanics were 11 percentage points below. At age 17, Black students were 16 percentage points below and Hispanics were 11 percentage points below (pp. 5-8).

The CBS television documentary "CBS Reports: Blacks in America: With All Deliberate Speed," aired in July 1979, pointed out that on the average Black students in high schools read at or below sixth-grade level.

2. Research evidence notwithstanding, I am even leery of the proposition that blames the problem solely on lack of books and magazines in the home. What about the millions of Blacks who achieved in spite of the fact that their parents couldn't read? Or what about the Asian and Hispanic Americans and American Indians who achieved in spite of the fact that their parents could not read or speak English?

3. "U.S. 'Caste System' Holds Blacks Back in School: Study," *Champaign-Urbana News Gazette*, March 15, 1978, p. A9. In this article, John Ogbu, author of *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (New York: Academic Press, 1978), states that his findings show that "Black youngsters have consistently performed at lower levels in schools than whites because [they realize] that they face a bleak future on the job market as adults."

4. Gray, Earl. *Black Enterprise*, August 1979. p. 9.
5. Giovanni, Nikki, "For Gwen Brooks from Nikki Giovanni." Preface to "Conversation: Gwen Brooks and Ida Lewis." *Essence*, April 1973. p. 26.
6. Hicks, Nancy. "Public Education: What's Happening to the Children?" *Black Enterprise*, September 1978. p. 31.
7. Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1977. p. 206.
8. "The Gap Narrows." *Enclave*, April 16, 1979. p. 4. "According to a Census Bureau survey, Black students have a lower dropout rate and a higher college enrollment than they did 10 years ago. . . . The proportion of Black students who drop out of high school declined from 35 percent to 25 percent over the past decade." "The number of blacks aged 16 and 17 attending high school has increased from 77 percent in 1960 to 86 percent in 1970. Sixteen percent of [young blacks] are attending college." See: *We, The Black Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, July 1972. p. 10.
- "Census Bureau figures also provide comparable data on other minorities. For example, about a third of the Spanish population is in school, including nearly 700,000 in high school and 223,000 attending college. This is a . . . higher proportion than the 29.3 percent for the entire population." See: *Nosotros, Los Americanos—We, the Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, June 1973. p. 13.
- "At the time of the 1970 census, about 30 percent of the Asian American population had completed at least 12 years of schooling, and more than 102,000 Asian Americans were enrolled in colleges and universities." See: *We, The Asian Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, June 1973. p. 14.
- "More than half of the [American Indians] between the ages of 3 and 34 were attending school in 1970. About 95 percent of [American Indian] children 7 to 13 years of age were in school in [1970]." College enrollment for American Indians more than doubled between 1960 and 1970. "Nine out of 10 [American Indian] children attend public schools." See: *We, The First Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, June 1973. pp. 5 and 14.
9. Not that the statement was ever worth the breath used to utter it since knowledge about minorities can be used in teaching all students.
10. Cornwell, Anita. "Attuned to the Energy: Sonia Sanchez." *Essence*, July 1979. p. 10.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Bennett, Lerone, Jr. "The Lost Found Generation." *Ebony*, April 1978. p. 40.
13. "U.S. 'Caste System' Holds Blacks Back in School: Study." p. A9.
14. The author wishes to extend special thanks to those who responded to the questionnaire.
15. Ogbu, John. *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press, 1978. pp. 25-26. (See also Chapter 5.)
16. National Council of Teachers of English. *Non-White Minorities in English and Language Arts Materials*. Urbana, Ill.: the Council, n.d..
17. *Ibid.*
18. The quotes and the idea are from Nikki Giovanni's poem, "Nikki Rosa." *Black Feeling, Black Talk, Black Judgment*. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970.
19. This statement in no way reflects my belief that minority studies (or such departments

at college levels) should be dropped. But students who would otherwise avoid taking such in-depth courses still need ways of acquiring knowledge about minorities.

20. Smitherman, Geneva. p. 219.

Additional Reading

Crain, Robert L., and Mahard, Rita E. *The Influence of High School Composition on Black College Attendance and Test Performance*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, January 1978.

CHAPTER 18

English for the Gifted and Talented

Jan A. Guffin

Dedicated and thoughtful teachers of English in the 1980's will probably wish for their gifted and talented students the same thing that such teachers wanted in the 1970's and the 1960's (and the 1860's, for that matter): the fullest realization of individual potential through meaningful action, reflection, and judgment. Despite the labels we choose to describe them, our goals as teachers and our fundamental approaches to accomplishing them vary only slightly from decade to decade, from generation to generation.

SOCIETAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Certain social factors that developed in the past decade will inevitably have significant bearing on the programs designed for the gifted and talented during the 80's. Following is a list of some of the features of the world that gifted and talented students not only participate in at present but also will help to manage in the future:

1. Thirty-seven percent of the world's population is now under the age of 15.
2. Nearly 100 percent of American homes have television sets which are used over six hours per day. Today's high school

graduate has spent 15,000 hours in front of television, 5,000 more hours than he or she has spent in the classroom.

3. We now produce 40,000 new books each year in the United States alone.
4. Thirty-three million dollars was spent in 17 days by patrons of the movie *Jaws*. By 1968, for every book a student had read, she or he had seen 20 films.
5. Over 400 million phone calls are made daily in the United States.
6. Over 400,000 American students travel about Europe during a single summer.¹
7. The average worker now has 1,200 hours more of nonwork time each year than he or she had at the turn of the century.
8. Our present labor force is composed of one-half white collar workers, one-third blue collar workers, one-seventh service personnel, and three percent farm workers.²

The English educator may draw three immediate conclusions from such a list of circumstances: (1) gifted and talented students inhabit a world governed largely by verbal and linguistic systems; (2) they are likely to be highly mobile adults in both professional and personal situations; and (3) they will be faced with the responsibility of making numerous decisions concerning the use of personal time.

Experts in the field of work, however, offer evidence that some of the statistics that apply to the general population do, in fact, vary for the gifted and talented. For example, the gifted and talented have traditionally entered the labor force at management levels and, for at least the last century, have been attracted to business and money making. Although they continue to enter at management levels and continue to pursue a comfortable standard of living, their career choices seem to have changed in the last decade or so: at present, gifted and talented students seek with satisfaction careers in educational administration, social service, and government.³

Researchers suggest that this phenomenon is in part the result of the increasing "cost" of leisure time. As productivity increases—and it has in the United States at the rate of 2 percent per year before the Second World War and 3 percent per year every year since⁴—consumers have to choose some combination of more goods and services and more leisure. Because Americans have a strong predilection for creature comforts, over the last century they have opted to allocate about two-thirds of the increased productivity to greater consumption of

goods and services and about one-third to more leisure. As a result of such a choice, the number of hours of work of professionals, managers, and administrators appears to be increasing while the number of hours for the work force in general continues to decline. Thus, for those in management-level positions, leisure is increasingly scarce, increasingly valuable.⁵

The gifted and talented seem to have arrived, either consciously or unconsciously, at the following decision: If I must work increasingly long hours at jobs for which I am educated and qualified—i.e., professional, managerial, and administrative jobs—I shall select a career that allows a high degree of personal satisfaction instead of merely a high salary, thus combining work and pleasure to offset the loss of leisure.

Further, researchers in career education suggest that with the exception of new and additional jobs that may stem from aggressive efforts to protect the environment, the broad occupational areas and industries in which people now work will not change drastically in the years ahead. And although the prospects for employment for the gifted and talented appear to be good, not simply the holding of a school credential but also the content of one's education and training will become hiring criteria; success in most professions will require graduate degrees—no longer will the "sheepskin" guarantee employment. These researchers suggest, too, that key skills for the gifted and talented will involve interpersonal relationships and information processing, that key words for the gifted and talented will be *service* and *self-fulfillment*.⁶

THE NATURE OF THE CURRICULUM

As we expand and refine our perceptions of the gifted and talented, as we improve our procedures for identifying such students, and as additional funding becomes available (new federal legislation has been introduced that could provide as much as \$50 million for 1980-83),⁷ our attitudes toward the nature and content of the curriculum are likely to change also. While program prototypes that have evolved over the last several decades are likely to remain, they are also likely to be modified during the 1980's. These prototypes are as follows:

Grouping: clusters; special classes; part-time groups before, during and after school or on Saturdays; seminars, mini-courses; resource or demonstration centers; itinerant or resource teachers; field trips and cultural events; special summer sessions.

Vertical acceleration: double-grade promotion; Advanced Placement, ungraded or multi-age classes; tutoring, correspondence courses,

credit by examination; independent study; extra classes for extra credit; early college admission.

Horizontal acceleration: individual or group research projects, study groups, part-time classes, clusters within regular classes, interest clubs, summer school.

Guidance: individual conferences, group meetings, career and vocational counseling, community programs and sponsorships, scholarship societies.⁶

Since education for the gifted and talented derives from the concept of differentiation, just as do special education programs, refinements in these prototypes are likely to occur as a result of a more deliberate attempt to offer a qualitatively different education by matching the range of educational environment with the range of giftedness. Public Law 94-142 urges school systems to provide the "least restrictive environment" for students requiring differentiated treatment. "Least restrictive" for the gifted and talented is often interpreted to mean an environment that offers the least restriction to the fullest realization of their personal and academic potential. Ironically, such an environment may be the most restrictive in terms of separation from the mainstream. Ranging in order from least to most restrictive environments for the gifted and talented are the following:

1. *No separation:* heterogeneous classes.
2. *Partial separation:* pull-out classes, clusters, honors and AP classes.
3. *Homogeneous:* special class placement for total school day within regular school facility, off-campus learning, internships.
4. *Total separation:* special center or placement for total school day in a separate facility, off-campus enrichment, internships.⁹

As we attempt to replace, supplement, or extend the standard curriculum to meet the needs of the gifted and talented, we will no doubt make stronger efforts (1) to design programs that embody a high level of cognitive and affective concepts beyond those of the regular curriculum; (2) to design and produce instructional materials exclusively for the gifted and talented and suitable to a variety of learning styles; (3) to encourage learning activities that differ from those of the regular classroom; (4) to promote flexible administrative arrangements for instruction and cultural enrichment, both in and out of school; and (5) to accept active parent involvement in the local school and in national, state, and community councils for the gifted.

THE CONTENT OF PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

The professional and societal circumstances of the 70's help explain the emphasis on individualization and differentiation for the gifted and talented during that decade. This trend will probably continue and will affect to a notable degree the content of curriculums in English for such students. It is not likely that we will abandon any of the standard components of the English curriculum during the 80's, but it is probable that we will alter the emphasis that some of those components traditionally have received.

Reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and language development, for example, are sure to remain key components of English programs for the gifted and talented, but each of these components is likely to be viewed and taught in relation to its inherent intellectual processes and, in turn, to the processes it shares with other program components. We have learned, for example, that teaching the isolated skills of reading does not necessarily improve the critical reading skills of students; that the teaching of grammar, a subcomponent of the writing process, does not guarantee good writers; that the teaching of vocabulary *per se* contributes minimally to the notion of language development in the largest sense.

We have come to realize, instead, that perceiving relationships among words, thoughts, or concepts is as common to effective speaking, clear writing, and intelligent viewing as it is to critical reading. We have also come to realize that differences in language experience are not valid indicators of intelligence or aptitude. Conversely, we have come to respect such differences and have accepted the responsibility for helping students broaden their intellectual frames of reference with language and their resilience in its practical use.

It seems reasonable, then, that we will try even harder in the 80's to refine and integrate the existing components of the English curriculum for the gifted and talented. As we begin to attend more seriously to a balance between cognitive and affective growth, we are likely to see that reading will include the development of skills both in critical reading and in analyzing one's personal response to a piece of literature; that writing will be taught as part of a composing process and will include an increasing variety of tasks related to an increasing variety of audiences; that listening, speaking, and viewing will be taught in relation to more clearly defined purposes—e.g., analyzing such factors as the interrelationships among speaker, subject, and audience; the quality and

effect of the language chosen for a given occasion; and the relationship between intention and effect.¹⁰

TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

As we systematically recognize, respect, and respond to both the expressive and the receptive skills of our students, we will inevitably alter instruction, which raises a final important question: Who will teach the gifted and talented students of the 1980's? Researchers fairly clearly answer the question: gifted and talented teachers.

To assign teachers of the gifted on the basis of seniority or in rotation is misguided "distributive justice" and downright misassignment, the factor that the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards ranks fifth among twelve factors that limit the quality of education.¹¹

Thus, though gifted and talented students may continue to learn in spite of teachers who are unprepared to teach them, many states have taken steps toward providing teachers with special training for such assignments. As of this writing, in 41 states, 28,000 individuals have received such training at state-sponsored conferences and workshops or at colleges and universities that offer courses leading to post-graduate degrees in teaching the gifted and talented. Seven states now grant gifted/talented training certification and two others plan to do so.¹²

The following qualities represent a composite of research findings related to the characteristics of teachers who have been most successful with gifted and talented students:

1. Maturity, experience, and professional educational leadership;
2. Mental superiority, among the top three percent of the adult population;
3. Avocational pursuits of intellectual, literary, and cultural interests;
4. High achievement in their own education;
5. High degree of ambiguity tolerance and curiosity;
6. Student-centeredness in the classroom, learners along with their students;
7. Classroom behavior that is orderly, systematic, businesslike, and structured yet not inflexibly strict; stimulating and imaginative;

8. Expertise in subject matter and enthusiasm for it;
9. Motivation of their students to want to study, to learn, to think divergently, to be creative, to feel concern for others, to overcome bigotry and selfishness;
10. Preference for teaching bright students.¹³

REFERENCES

1. Farrell, Edmund J. "Forces at Work: English Teaching in Context, Present to Perhaps." *The Teaching of English. Seventy-Sixth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education.* (Edited by James R. Squire.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977. pp. 309-340, *passim*.
2. Hoyt, Kenneth B., and Hebel, Jean R., editors. *Career Education for Gifted and Talented Students.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Company, 1974. p. 74.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 79.
7. Pannwitt, Barbara. "Lest the Gifted Be Unseen: Qualitatively Different Education." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Curriculum Report* 8(ii): 2; December 1978.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
9. *Ibid.*
10. For a full discussion of these points in relation to current trends in humanities, literature, language, composition, and reading, see: Copeland, Evelyn M., and others. "Changing Content in the English Curriculum." *The Teaching of English. Seventy-Sixth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education.* (Edited by James R. Squire.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977. pp. 145-196.
11. Pannwitt, Barbara. p. 5
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 19

English for the Handicapped

Nancy S. McHugh

At present all of the persons involved in Special Education or Education for the Handicapped—administrators, supervisors, teachers, aides, parents, children, and community resource people—are engaged in a massive experiment mandated by Public Law 94-142. This law demands that handicapped children have individualized programs tailored to their special needs and that these children receive the various facets of their education in the "least restrictive environment." The law may sound simple, but its ramifications are complicated and far reaching as it is applied to both handicapped and other children. The success or failure of this massive and idealistic effort will determine in large measure not only the fate of exceptional children in the 80's but also the fate of education in general. The two have become intricately tied; the amalgamation can provide for both segments either renewal or disaster.

THE CATALYSTS

A number of factors or controlling forces have influenced the course of education for the handicapped and will continue to do so in either mainstreamed or more restrictive and traditional settings in the 80's. Among these are *money, parent power, court action, administrative demands, class size, proficiency tests, and integration for racial balance.*

Because funds for education are fast drying up, there will be competition for moneys in the 80's. Although in most states the amount of money allocated for special education children is based on the average daily attendance of the pupils served, money is also allotted through special grants made by category. With the advent of mainstreaming (the infusion of many handicapped children into regular school settings), it is reasonable to assume that some categorical moneys will follow these mainstreamed students to cover increased costs in counseling, programming, remediation, and special resources and facilities. Having sufficient money will be crucial to the success of programs in both mainstreamed schools and restricted schools in terms of class size, support personnel, materials, and programs. Already some large school systems are reporting that they are able to serve fewer handicapped children because of increased costs in the new responsibilities for identification and programming. New equipment will be available, but many schools may not be able to afford it. And any increased acceptance of federal moneys will mean more federal control—and more parent and student reaction to it.

Parent power has been a prime factor in the improvement of education of the handicapped. By petitioning local agencies and winning court decisions, parents of those needing special education have cleared away mountains of red tape and moved recalcitrant authorities. Now they must by law be involved in the design of their children's Individualized Education Programs (IEP). They may prove to be a very positive force in the success and honesty of mainstreamed programs; they may also pull back from mainstreaming if they feel that their children's needs are not being met. With the regular school program more readily available for their examination, parents of the handicapped may be a positive force in enlarging the scope of the language arts curriculum for their children.

Court action has been a powerful means of redressing inequities in education for the handicapped. It helped to bring PL 94-142 into being and will be the means by which mainstreaming is tested. PL 95-561 carries with it a strong mandate for basic skills education—including reading, writing, and oral language, as well as computation—for all students. State proficiency laws may appear to be in conflict with IEP evaluation, giving rise to malpractice suits or suits against the local district for the granting of diplomas and certificates that may discriminate against the handicapped. The whole area of student rights, particularly with regard to the "least restrictive environment," will be subject to adjudication.¹

Administrative demands may be plus or minus factors in the education of the handicapped in the 80's. In the last analysis, administrators will have to make the crucial decisions about the identification of students,

the provision of Individualized Education Programs, and the granting of diplomas. They will be under great pressure to provide flexible staffing and reduced class size to enable regular teachers, as well as special education teachers, to meet the needs of handicapped students. They will have to encourage teachers to become involved in staff development, team teaching with special education teachers, and interaction with resource persons and parents. As educational leaders, they will be expected to monitor the curriculum to see that it achieves a balance between its vocational and liberal arts components.

Class size deserves special consideration in the midst of these crucial factors. With extra burdens placed on teachers, particularly language arts teachers, in terms of proficiency demands, class size will be a crucial factor in the fair treatment of handicapped students in regular classrooms (in mere physical terms, visual and hearing impaired students must be seated so that they can see/hear the teacher and their classmates all or most of the time), in time spent on task for individualized learning, and in building teacher morale. Perhaps some system of weighting formulas can be used to determine class size: for example, 1 point factor for the average student, 1.5 for the slow learner, 2.5 for the emotionally disturbed, etc.² A teacher of language arts in the 80's in a mainstreamed classroom might be required to manage a factor of 25 (based on the quota of 25 average students so long requested by language arts teachers), a factor that would involve far fewer students if some of them were handicapped.

Proficiency tests will continue to be a prime educational factor in the 80's, perhaps being constantly tested in the courts. On the one hand, people in special education want particularly for their students to be proficient in language skills, for only then will they be able to make their needs known and have some control over their lives. But standardized proficiencies, based on the abilities of average children at a given chronological age or stage, may be utterly unfair and unworkable for handicapped students at the time that the measurement is given and the placement made. Too stringent an attempt to force handicapped children into this mold will result in untold damage to their esteem and motivation, and may lead to additional legal challenges. Stringency in this area may further restrict the curriculum of both the handicapped and the regular children.

Integration for racial balance, a desirable goal for all educational systems, is still another factor that could lead to gain or loss in the education of the handicapped and the regular children in the mainstreamed school environment. On the one hand, the world will open up for many handicapped students who have formed an unreal picture of humanity

based on isolated educational environments. The demands for individual rights and due process will be strengthened by applicants from among those who are isolated because of race and disability. On the other hand, the additional pressures placed on administrators, teachers, transportation facilities, etc., may bog down the system to the point that no one receives individual attention or meaningful education. The additional danger exists that students may be misdiagnosed because of previous educational disadvantages and, as a result, be treated for the wrong learning problems in the wrong ways.

PREDICTIONS

In spite of the dangers inherent in the catalysts or controlling forces, we may opt for a positive series of predictions for the education of the handicapped in language arts during the 80's. A number of influences point the way: *increased technology, better and earlier diagnosis of handicaps and disabilities, a broadening of curriculum and experience, better preparation of teachers* through initial training and staff development, and *a more humane attitude* on the part of society toward the handicapped.

Increased technology has already provided heightened maneuverability and better functioning for handicapped children, and it will continue to do so. The technology will improve not only in prosthetic appliances but also in all sorts of audiovisual aids to enhance learning for both handicapped and regular students pursuing IEPs at least part of the time. Computer outlets, television screens, and electronic cuers are only a few of these possibilities.³

Tied in with better technology is *better and earlier diagnosis* of student handicaps, learning disabilities, etc. Homer Reed, Jr., has suggested that the field of neuropsychology will make possible the diagnosis of impairment and function in terms of learning as well as condition.⁴ Students with quite different handicapping conditions might have the same learning disability in a specific instance and, thus, receive the same or nearly the same treatment. Earlier and more exact diagnosis may result in less learning disability because of lowered self-esteem and in the presence of fewer handicapped students at upper levels.

We may expect a *broadening of the curriculum* for handicapped students as a result of mainstreaming, of parent and student familiarity with the regular curriculum, and of improved goals and innovations. While handicapped students will continue to need and desire basic skills of language acquisition and vocational preparation, they will also be exposed to curriculum that enhances the quality of life, that provides food

for the spirit and the imagination: literature, written expression, humanities. Those strategies that regular teachers will have incorporated in their curriculums will also serve the handicapped: clustering and other "right brain" aids to thinking and relating, sentence combining, a broadening of the domains of writing and techniques for eliciting written expression that are "real" and for "real" audiences. While IEPs may become the rule for all students, handicapped and regular, during part of the training, all students will benefit from group process and social interaction. Students will learn to face and overcome prejudices about the "different" in their midst.

Better preparation of teachers through initial training and staff development will have to occur if mainstreaming is to be tried on a large scale, let alone to succeed. Special students and regular students will both benefit from teachers who are better versed in learning theory and observation as well as in subject content and methods. The interaction, including team teaching, that will take place as a result of mainstreaming and interaction with the isolated schools will change philosophy and perspective as well as technique. Teachers of handicapped students and teachers of regular students have much to learn from each other. Many regular teachers need to be made aware of the components and benefits of carefully sequenced incremental learning. They need to learn better how to diagnose, individualize, and remediate. They need to learn how to protect the student's self-image as they also correct and confer. Many special education teachers need to realize the enormous possibilities inherent in the broader curriculum and in some of the innovations in writing and language learning that regular teachers are perfecting. Effective direction of this interaction will be the job of administration in the 80's.

A more humane attitude, not only toward the handicapped but also toward all human beings, will be the outcome of a successful mainstream venture in the 80's. The joint venture will offer advantages to both handicapped students and regular students and to all who interact with them: parents, teachers, administrators, and community resource persons. This is and will be a venture in cooperation, participation, self-actualization, equality, competency, mastery, balance, and altruism. We can share the definition of education, particularly in language arts, that proposes "teaching and learning which utilizes generalization, insight, precept, and abstraction which ultimately generate understanding and promote transfer to creative or self-inspired behavior."⁵ And perhaps for the 1980's we can dream with A. Earle, professor of English at the University of British Columbia:

The kind [of democracy] that will prove most helpful to the development of humanity is that which will not assume all men to be equal, or strive to educate them all equally, but will give to each the opportunity to discover and develop whatever is superior within him and encourage and give creative direction to those whose talents are less or different.⁶

In the 80's English for the handicapped will be both exciting and valuable.

REFERENCES

1. Dunn, Rita, and Cole, Robert W. "Inviting Malpractice Through Mainstreaming." *Educational Leadership*, February 1979. pp. 302-307.
2. Reynolds, Maynard, and Birch, Jack. *Teaching Exceptional Children in America's Schools: A First Course for Teachers and Principals*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977. pp. 691-692.
3. Shane, Harold G. "Forecast in the 80's." *Today's Education*, April/May 1979. p. 65.
4. Reed, Homer, Jr. "Biological Defects and Special Education: An Issue in Personnel Preparation." *Journal of Special Education*, Spring 1979. For suggestions on categories according to skill level, see also: "The Yet To Be Served." *Exceptional Children*, April 1979. pp. 502-506.
5. Hellmuth, Jerome, editor. *The Special Child in Century 21*. Seattle: Special Child Publications, Inc., 1964. p. 82.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

Additional Readings

- Anker, Carol Tieg. *Teaching Exceptional Children: A Special Career*. New York: Julian Messner, 1978.
- Cruikshank, William, and Johnson, G. Orville, editors. *Education of Exceptional Children and Youth*. Third edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Haring, Norris G., and Bateman, Barbara. *Teaching the Learning Disabled*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Schwartz, Lita Linzer. *The Exceptional Child: A Primer*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.

CHAPTER 20

Needed Research in the Teaching of English

Roy C. O'Donnell

Because foreseeing the future requires abilities that I have never possessed, it is fortunate that I was not asked to predict what sort of research in the teaching of English will be *done* in the decade of the 80's. It is much easier to deal with the question of what sort of research is *needed*. Perhaps that question can best be approached by looking first at what sort of research has already been done.

When the tenth volume of the journal *Research in the Teaching of English* was completed, I did a survey of the articles that had been published in that journal since its inception.¹ It is obvious that not all the research related to the teaching of English has been published in *RTE*, but I thought the articles that had been published there would provide a useful profile of the studies completed between 1967 and 1977. Having never found the time to do a more comprehensive survey, I still regard the sample as representative of the best research in the field for that 10-year period.

Of the 176 articles published, 53 (30 percent) deal with various aspects of teaching English at the secondary level, 30 (17 percent) with college-level English, and 37 (21 percent) with elementary and pre-school English. The remainder either deal with multiple grade levels or could not be classified by grade level. Sixty-eight (39 percent) are concerned with pupil characteristics (abilities, attitudes, etc.), 25 (14 per-

cent) with teaching method, and 22 (12.5 percent) with curriculum and materials. Sixteen (9 percent) are concerned with evaluation methods and an equal number with research methods. Fifty-one (29 percent) of the articles focus on composition, 43 (24 percent) on language, and 27 (15 percent) on literature. Twenty-one articles (12 percent) are concerned with reading, but only one deals with nonprint media, and only one focuses on drama.

Almost half of the studies could be classified as descriptive (including six case studies), and about one out of every seven as quasi-experimental. Only six could be classified as true experimental studies, and there is only one historical study.

More than two-thirds (124) of the studies are reported by a single author, and nearly nine-tenths (152) have been prepared by persons affiliated with colleges and universities. Only a few of the articles have been written by secondary or elementary school personnel.

A more comprehensive survey—including books, the various journals that publish reports of research related to the teaching of English, and the ERIC materials—would be useful; but the total profile probably would not differ much from what is reflected in the pages of *RTE*. It would also be useful to extend the survey of *RTE* articles through 1979, but my subjective impression is that the extension would produce similar findings. Perhaps there would be relatively more case studies, more studies dealing with language and composition, and more studies at the college level, but the overall picture probably would not be altered much. It is probably true that throughout the decade of the 70's more research effort was directed toward the secondary level than the college level, more toward both language and composition than literature, and more toward reading than nonprint media. There probably was far more descriptive research than experimental, and the total number of case studies probably was small. Also, it is probably true that most of the research was done by university professors and graduate students; it is not likely that a significant proportion of the research related to the teaching of English was done by elementary or secondary teachers.

It would be interesting to compare my survey with earlier statements concerning needed research in the teaching of English, but it is not possible here even to summarize what I regard as the most significant research completed in the 70's. Nevertheless, the profile drawn from the survey of *RTE* articles provides a useful background for projections of the kind of research we need in the 80's. While quantity of research in a given area has no necessary relation to how much more research is needed in that area, it is interesting to note certain areas that have received scant attention.

Although a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the educational value of dramatic activities and nonprint media, there is very little research documenting their value and almost none concerning their utilization in the English classroom. There is a similar lack of proportion between the amount of commentary on the need to go back to "basics" and the amount of research designed to define what is basic and to find the most effective ways to teach basic knowledge and skills. Likewise, the massive amount of material that has been written about accountability in the use of educational resources has not been accompanied by good research on the various methods of evaluation and the validity and reliability of evaluation instruments. Although the single historical study published in *RTE* is not the only historical study completed in the 70's,² it seems that more attention should be given to the history of various aspects of teaching English. Knowledge about the mistakes of previous generations might help us to avoid needless repetition.

The contents of the present work provides another useful point of reference in a discussion of needed research.

Numerous studies of writing, literature, and language (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) have been done, and the decade of the 70's has produced significant advances in these areas. Concentrated attention on composing processes in recent years has laid the foundations for greater advances during the decade of the 80's—advances that are certain to be made. Research in response to literature has been fruitful, but research on the teaching of literature generally has received less attention than it deserves; a great deal more research in this area needs to be done in the 80's.

Substantial beginnings have been made on brain research and English (Chapter 4).

The unfortunate division of speech and English as school subjects has encouraged separate treatment of these areas in research studies, but oral language as part of the English curriculum (Chapter 5) was the topic of much discussion during the 70's. Ways to facilitate oral language communication and to relate it to the development of skills in written communication deserve the special attention of researchers during the coming decade.

No topic has received more attention in educational research than reading, but reading in relation to the teaching of English (Chapter 6) has not been adequately researched. Perhaps the next 10 years will bring significant advances in such research. The need for research in the basics (Chapter 7) has already been cited.

Various studies have focused on English in the elementary and

middle grades (Chapters 8 and 9). If the growing emphasis on the middle school as a distinct entity leads to a redefinition of the language arts curriculum at these grade levels, such a redefinition should be accompanied by appropriate research.

Never has much research been focused on the training of English teachers (Chapter 10) as distinct from the training of teachers in general. English teachers have special concerns, and to the extent that the problems of teaching English are unique, we need research that deals with these peculiar problems. Perhaps more research is needed to identify what is peculiar to the teaching of English and how this uniqueness can best be handled in the training of teachers; the 80's may see advances in this direction.

Visual literacy and the media (Chapters 11 and 12) deserve their place in the English curriculum, but they have not received adequate attention from researchers. How to give them the emphasis they should have without seeming to crowd out the so-called "basics" presents problems that should challenge English educators and researchers in the 80's. Efforts to computerize some aspects of instruction in English (Chapter 13) were a topic of much interest in the late 60's and early 70's, but they seem to have had little impact on how English is taught in most schools. Perhaps further advances will result from appropriate research.

English as a second language (Chapter 14) has received less attention in the United States than it has in England, but the growing population of those whose native language is not English makes research in this area imperative. Similarities between the problems of those learning English as a second language and those learning "standard" English as a second dialect (Chapter 17) have been recognized, but more research is needed to clarify similarities and differences and to develop effective teaching methods.

English for vocational students (Chapter 15) has received some attention over the years, but it is difficult to identify significant research problems peculiar to the vocational classroom. Selection of appropriate materials and teaching strategies for vocational students requires continuing research, but the basic concerns are similar for these and other students in the schools. Research on sexual stereotypes (Chapter 16) has received considerable attention in the 70's and will probably continue to receive attention in the 80's.

English for the gifted (Chapter 18) has been emphasized in a number of schools, but not a great deal of research has been focused on this topic. Like English for the vocational student, it demands special materials and teaching strategies, but perhaps the basic concerns of teaching

English to these students are not unique. To the extent that research can assist in bringing to full realization the talents of gifted students in the English classroom, it deserves our careful attention.

Mainstreaming of handicapped students (Chapter 19) presents new challenges to English teachers, as it does to all classroom teachers. Most of the related problems are probably not unique to the English classroom, and the English-related concerns of these students may not be very different from those of other students. Specialized research on this topic is needed.

The preceding comments on needed research may sound like the familiar refrain found in the concluding section of most research reports. It is true that we need more research in the areas cited, but we also need some changes in the way research is done. My survey of *RTE* articles showed that most of the research reported was carried out by university professors and graduate students. What it does not show, but what is probably true nonetheless, is that most of the readers of the reports are other university professors and graduate students. Consequently, whatever impact the findings have on classroom instruction is likely to be indirect and delayed. It seems obvious that research will have more meaning to classroom teachers if they are more involved in it. In view of the fact that a relatively high percentage of teachers holds graduate degrees, it does not seem unreasonable to expect their involvement to a greater degree in educational research. In addition to the possibilities of research initiated and carried out by teachers in their own schools, there are rich possibilities for cooperative efforts involving classroom teachers, graduate students, and university professors. Research projects with a particular focus on local concerns could no doubt be provided through in-service teacher education programs.

More important than who is involved in the research enterprise is the quality of research. At the same time we are broadening the scope of involvement, we need to improve quality. The research done by doctoral candidates has the immediate and frequently overriding purpose of satisfying degree requirements. To be practical, graduate students must identify research problems that can be dealt with in a reasonable period of time, and unless they are supported by a grant, the cost of the project must be within their means. While many of these studies are of high quality, the limitations of this approach to research are obvious. At the other extreme, professional researchers are knowledgeable about research design and data analysis, but many of them are not close enough to the problems and concerns of English teachers to do the kind of research that is needed.

What is needed most at this time is research that is grounded in

theory, soundly designed, and oriented to the problems teachers confront in their classrooms. Fortunately, there is evidence that English educators are developing a sensitivity to the need for a theory of their discipline, and as a result progress is being made toward an articulate formulation of theory. Cooperative efforts involving scholars who have mastered their discipline and are knowledgeable about research design and data analysis and classroom teachers who understand the purposes and techniques of meaningful research can move us toward solutions to the problems that have remained unsolved. Perhaps research developments in the decade of the 80's will move in that direction.

REFERENCES

1. O'Donnell, Roy C. *Studies in Language Education Report No. 31*. Athens: University of Georgia, 1977.
2. Arthur Applebee's *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History* was published by The National Council of Teachers of English in 1974.

CHAPTER 21

A Classroom Teacher's Crystal Ball for Teaching English in the 80's

Mildred Gamble

When I learned that the NEA intended to publish a compilation of essays under the title *EDUCATION IN THE 80's: ENGLISH*, I had two main concerns. The first was whether or not the publication would be read by English teachers themselves. The second was whether or not some of the essays would be written by teacher advocates with strong classroom ties.

Regarding the first concern, I suspect that Roy C. O'Donnell (Chapter 20) is correct in speculating that the most frequent readers of research reports are university professors and graduate students. I suspect, too, that my own experience is representative. It is a sad comment on the allocation of time and money within public education when I note that it was not until I left the classroom after 23 years to serve as a teacher-coordinator of language arts that I could buy and read professional journals and research quarterlies regularly and could attend state and national workshops and conventions to hear the leaders in my chosen field speak about our charge, report upon research, and articulate our positions.

Having within the last three years joined those English educators who have opportunities to present workshops to teachers in various states, I have found that there are many teachers "out there" who have not heard of sentence combining, peer group editing, holistic assess-

ment, primary trait analysis, T-units, or the cumulative sentence. There are even more who are unacquainted with the contributions to the profession by such notables as Francis Christensen, Kellogg Hunt, James Moffett, Frank O'Hare, Charles Cooper, James Gray, and Mina Shaughnessy. There are countless others who have not heard of the Dartmouth Conference of 1966, the York Conference of 1972, or the Sydney Conference of 1980. I make these observations not as a criticism of teachers but rather as an indictment of a system that subverts professional growth. I am more convinced each year that a strong united teaching profession is the only effective means for gaining negotiated changes that will provide teachers with the time and the funds for keeping up to date in their profession. When that time comes—and it will—professional publications such as this one will be common reading fare for practicing teachers of English. In fact, classroom teachers will be writing many of the articles.

I accepted the invitation to contribute my predictions to this document because I am a teacher advocate with vast classroom experience and because I have, during the 70's, had numerous opportunities to become current in my field and to become aware of trends in education. What I see for the 80's in my crystal ball is both exciting and disquieting. Some of my predictions address specific concerns of teachers of English; others are more general, but important nonetheless.

1. "Writing across the curriculum" will be the major educational thrust of the 80's. The research findings in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States during the 70's indicate that learning in all disciplines can be enhanced when writing is taught as a process.
2. During the 80's, effective strategies will commonly be employed to move the findings of research into the classrooms. The bridge between the university community and the teaching community, which was built by the Bay Area Writing Project and its many satellite projects throughout the nation during the last half of the 70's, will continue to serve as a model for effective research-based staff development programs.
3. Sentence combining will become a main instructional technique for moving students into syntactic structures of increasing maturity. As students develop manipulative skill in how words and ideas combine and insight into the ideational relationships established through specific combinations, comprehension in reading, along with skill in sentencng, will increase.

4. The structuring of assignments in all areas of English education will improve dramatically. During the 70's teachers of writing began to see the value of structuring assignments for a specific and real purpose and for a specific and real audience. They also began to plan the sequence of activities embodied within an assignment to correspond closely with what is known about how children learn. This trend will continue and gain strength during the 80's.
5. English teachers during the 80's will learn to distinguish between formative and summative evaluation of writing and to know the power of both. They will learn to use techniques and scales for both holistic and primary-trait assessment of writing. They will honor the students' right to know by using the techniques and scales during the formative stages of writing, usually with peer editing groups. Teachers working in concert will provide summative evaluations of student writing.¹
6. Teachers will become increasingly aware of the need to begin with the learners' own experiences and then move the students through a de-centering process to achieve a global perspective on what it means to be human. This movement away from egocentrism will need to be coordinated with the growth cycle itself.
7. The close monitoring of textbook selection in state-adoption states will continue to impact on education. National in scope, this "save the children" movement will produce increased organized attacks by groups wishing to remove certain books, certain filmstrips, certain concepts, and certain instructional techniques from the classrooms of America. It will take the thoughtful and organized power of NEA, NCTE, and other groups dedicated to the principles of freedom within a democracy to counter these attacks.
8. "Single issue" advocates will continue to impact on education as they have on politics. Greater and greater segmentation will be fostered by specialized funding. More and more children will be labeled by greater and greater numbers of labels. The divisive nature of segmentation will be a counterforce in education until advocates of holistic approaches can obtain the political power now enjoyed by single issue advocates.
9. As advocates for children, the nation's teachers will issue strong and vital pleas for responsible parenting by displaying convinc-

ing evidence that each child's learning potential is shaped more in the home than in the school. Parenting classes will be prevalent in the 80's as parents learn the techniques of adding language and manipulative experiences to the traditional tender loving care.

Having recorded my statements for others to view, I urge those who read them to take pen in hand and do likewise with their own predictions. For me, writing my thoughts down has been a process of discovery. Let us together, then, in 1990, retrieve our respective lists to see how clear or how clouded our vision was.

REFERENCE

1. For substantive and sound information on implementing these approaches, see: Cooper, Charles R., and O'Dell, Lee, editors. *Evaluating Writing*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Betty P. Cleaver is Director of the Edgar Dale Educational Media and Instructional Materials Laboratory of the College of Education at The Ohio State University in Columbus. She holds a Doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction from Duke University and also holds a Master's Degree in Library Science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Charles R. Duke is Associate Professor of English at Murray State University in Kentucky. Professor Duke is the author of *Creative Dramatics and English Teaching*, *Teaching Fundamental English Today*, and *Teaching Literature Today*. He has published over 50 articles on the teaching of English and is currently the editor of *Exercise Exchange*.

Mildred Gamble is Teacher-Coordinator of K-12 language arts in the St. Vrain Valley Schools in Colorado. She was a 1977 Summer Fellow in the Bay Area Writing Project and since then has conducted composition workshops for teachers in Alaska, California, Colorado, Missouri, New Hampshire, and Wyoming. She holds a B.A. from Northern Michigan University and an M.A.T. from Colorado State University.

Sandra E. Gibbs is Director of Minority Group Affairs and Special Projects for the National Council of Teachers of English. She holds A.M. and Ph.D. degrees in English from the University of Illinois and is a frequent consultant on minority affairs.

Jeffrey N. Golub is a teacher at Kent Junior High School, Kent, Washington. He has served as Executive Secretary of the Washington State Council of Teachers of English, and is Co-editor of the "Jr. High/Middle School Idea Factory," a column appearing regularly in *English Journal*.

Yetta M. Goodman is Professor of Elementary Education at the University of Arizona in Tucson. She is a past president of the National Council of Teachers of English. She is well known for her writing in the field of miscue analysis.

Jan A. Guffin is Department Chair in English at North Central High School in Indianapolis, Indiana. He also chairs the College Board English Test Development Committee and is a Consulting Editor for *The Clearing*

House. He holds a Ph.D. in English Education from Duke University and is the author of numerous professional articles.

Beverly Bates Heneghan is Assistant Professor of English at Northern Virginia Community College in Annandale, where she is also Director of the Writing Center and of the World Cultures Study Program. Ms. Heneghan has been a frequent consultant on questions relating to sexism.

Theodore W. Hipple is Professor of English Education at the University of Florida in Gainesville. He serves as Chair of the Executive Committee of the Conference on English Education, and he is well known for such books as *Teaching English in Secondary Schools*, *Crucial Issues in Contemporary Education*, and *The Future of Education: 1975-2000*. He holds a Ph.D. in English Education from the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign.

Marvin Klein is Associate Professor of Education at Western Washington University in Bellingham. His area of special concentration is Speech Education. He has served as the English Language Arts Supervisor for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin.

Charles J. Law, Jr., is Deputy Assistant State Superintendent for Education and Work for the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI). He previously served as Director of the Division of Vocational Education for the NCDPI. He is the author of *A Proposed Frame of Reference for Decision-Making in Vocational Education*.

Nancy S. McHugh is a Teacher Advisor for the Los Angeles (California) Unified School District. She is Director of an ESEA Title IV-C Writing Project for the Los Angeles City Schools. Ms. McHugh holds a Master's Degree from the University of California at Los Angeles and is President of the California Association of Teachers of English, whose Committee on Sexism she chairs. She also chairs the NCTE Committee on Exceptional Children.

James Morrow is Co-director of the Institute for Multimedia Learning in Westford, Massachusetts. He is a Contributing Editor to *Media and Methods*. He is also co-author of *Media and Kids: Real World Learning in the Schools*, *Moviemaking Illustrated: The Comicbook Filmbook*, and *The Grammar of Media Kit*. Two of his films, *Children of the Morning* and *A Political Cartoon*, have won national awards.

Donald M. Murray is Professor of English and former English Department Chair at the University of New Hampshire, Durham. A Pulitzer-

Prize-winning journalist, he is well known for his widely used book, *A Writer Teaches Writing*.

Roy C. O'Donnell is Professor of Education and Chairman of the Department of Language Education at the University of Georgia in Athens. He is Editor of *Research in the Teaching of English* and is a member of the NCTE Committee on Research. He is also a former trustee of the Research Foundation of NCTE.

William S. Palmer is Professor of Education at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. He holds a Doctorate in English Education from the University of California at Berkeley. His publications on the teaching of reading have received wide distribution in such journals as *English Journal*, *The Journal of Reading*, *The High School Journal*, *The Reading Journal*, and *Reading Research Quarterly*.

Richard S. Powers teaches exposition and literature courses at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, where he is also a graduate student in English. Mr. Powers, originally a physics major, is well versed in the use of computers. He is also an accomplished poet and short story writer and has won national poetry awards.

Bob Samples is well known for his work in hemisphericity and presently directs Hawksong in Boulder, Colorado. He is perhaps best known for *The Metaphoric Mind*. He is a frequent consultant to educational institutions as well as to industry.

R. Baird Shuman is Professor of English, Director of English Education, and Director of Freshman Rhetoric at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. He is the author of over 300 articles and has written or edited 12 books.

Gary Tate is Professor of English at Texas Christian University, where he is Director of Writing Workshops. He also serves as Director of the NCTE Commission on Composition and chairs the NCTE Committee on Writing Standards for Title II of ESEA. He is the author of *Teaching High School Composition*, *Reflections on High School Teaching: NDEA Institute Lectures 1965*, and *Teaching Composition: 10 Bibliographical Essays*. His collaboration, *Essays on Composing*, is soon to be released by the Oxford University Press.

Iris M. Tiedt is Director of the South Bay Area Writing Project at San José State University. Her Ph.D. in English Education is from Stanford University. A prolific writer, Professor Tiedt is a former editor of *Language Arts* and is presently Editor of *Reading Ideas* and of *Ideas and Materials Workshop*. She is the author or editor of seven books.

Denny T. Wolfe, Jr., is Associate Professor of Education at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. He served for six years as Director of the Division of Languages for the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. He has written over 50 articles, has contributed chapters to professional books, and is himself the editor of three books on the teaching of English. He holds a Ph.D. in English Education from Duke University.